DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 335 VT 013 329

AUTHOR	Killinger, George G., Ed.; And Others
TITLE	National Conference on Pre-Release. A Symposium on Adult Offender Programs, Halfway House, Pre-Release, and Work Release.
INSTITUTION	Sam Houston State Coll., Huntsville, Tex. Inst. of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences.; Texas State Dept. of Corrections, Huntsville.
PUB DATE	67
NOTE	105p.; Proceedings of a Conference (Huntsville, Tex., Nov. 1-4, 1967)
AVAILABLE FROM	Sam Houston State College, Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences, Huntsville, Texas 77340 (no charge)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports, *Correctional Rehabilitation, Drug Addiction, Educational Needs, Employment Programs, *Prisoners, *Program Development, *Program Evaluation, Rehabilitation Programs, Vocational Education, Work Experience Programs

ABSTRACT

Seventy-four participants attended the 4-day National Conference on Pre-Release Programs for a symposium on adult offender programs. Presentations heard included: (1) "Halfway House Programs--A National Overview" by O.J. Keller, Jr., (2) "The Evolving Program of a Privately Operated Halfway House" by Robert P. Taylor, (3) "The Employment Program of a Halfway House for Narcotic Addicts" by Keith Turkinton, (4) "Correctional Assumptions and Their Program Implications" by Vincent O'Leary, (5) "The Changing Program of Pre-Release at the Federal Level" by Gerald A. Collins, (6) "A Warden Looks at Pre-Release" by J.E. Baker, (7) "The STEP Program and Work Release" by Robert E. Joyce, (8) "Management and Operation of a Work Release Program" by Robert Anderson, and (9) "The News Media and Work Release" by Kuyk Logan. (JS)

ED052335

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
George G. Killinger, Ph.D., Director

SAM HOUSTON STATE COLLEGE
Arleigh B. Templeton, Ed.D., President

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
George J. Beto, Ph.D., Director

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PRE-RELEASE

A SYMPOSIUM ON ADULT OFFENDER PROGRAMS

HALFWAY HOUSE
PRE-RELEASE
WORK RELEASE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROCEEDINGS OF
A CONFERENCE
Huntsville, Texas
November 1-4, 1967

VT 013329

Editing: George G. Killinger, Ph.D.
Hazel B. Kerper, J.D.
Donald J. Weisenhorn, M.S.W.
Jacqueline A. Benfield, B. S.

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

George G. Killinger, Ph.D., Director

SAM HOUSTON STATE COLLEGE

Arleigh B. Templeton, Ed.D., President

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

George J. Beto, Ph.D., Director

PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE

George G. Killinger, Ph.D., Chairman

Donald J. Weisenhorn, M.S.W., Assistant Chairman

Leo Jenkins, Colorado

Wint Hughes, Wisconsin

W. Dee Kutach, Texas

T. C. Sanders, Texas

John Twomey, Ph.D., Illinois

J. E. Baker, New Mexico

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome — *George G. Killinger, Ph.D.* 1

Halfway House Programs — A National Overview
O. J. Keller, Jr. 9

The Evolving Program of A Privately Operated
Halfway House — *Reverend Robert P. Taylor* . . 23

The Employment Program of a Halfway House for
Narcotic Addicts — *Keith Turkinton* 31

Group Discussion — Problems and Progress in Our
Programs — *Leo Jenkins, Moderator* 40

Correctional Assumptions and Their Program
Implications — *Vincent O'Leary* 41

The Changing Program of Pre-Release at the
Federal Level — *Gerald A. Collins* 49

A Warden Looks at Pre-Release — *J. E. Baker* 59

Group Discussions — Problems of Research in
Corrections — *George M. Camp, Ph.D., Moderator* 66

The STEP Program and Work Release — *Robert E. Joyce* . . 67

Management and Operation of a Work Release
Program — *Robert Anderson* 73

The News Media and Work Release — *Kuyk Logan* 82

Group Discussion — The Future of the National Conference on
Pre-Release — *J. E. Baker, Moderator* 92

National Pre-Release Seminar Participants 94

Program 99

WELCOME

GEORGE G. KILLINGER, Ph.D.

DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SAM HOUSTON STATE COLLEGE

I would like to begin by welcoming you to the Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences of Sam Houston State College. We feel highly honored in having been chosen, together with the Texas Department of Corrections, to host this National Symposium on pre-release, work release, and community-based programs. During the past two years, we have had a lecture series by distinguished speakers, criminologists, and penologists in this field, and invariably our students have said to these speakers, "In the next ten years and in the last decade, what do you think the greatest advances in the treatment of the offender have been?" Each speaker has said, "Community-based programs, pre-release and work release activities will be the thing of the future, and the thing that we must consider." So, we are glad to have you here so we can get an overview of what we are doing in this area, and where we may go from here. As director, I extend to you greetings and a hearty welcome and hope that this will be a most profitable and pleasant experience for you.

Now, I have a most pleasant moment, when I have the opportunity to present to you the two men whose insight made the Institute of Contemporary Corrections possible, and through whose support, cooperation, and undying efforts, we have been able to move this Institute program into one of national eminence and to attract to this campus the largest undergraduate and graduate student body in the area of corrections and law enforcement in the entire United States. It is my privilege and honor to present to you our distinguished friend and benefactor, Dr. Arleigh B. Templeton, President of Sam Houston State College.

ARLEIGH B. TEMPLETON, Ed.D.

PRESIDENT OF SAM HOUSTON STATE COLLEGE

Thank you, Dr. Killinger. It is a pleasure to welcome you to the Sam Houston State College campus and to Huntsville. I hope that this program will be worthwhile for you. To have you here will certainly help Sam Houston to move its program ahead. We have a stated policy here, "If you don't like what you are getting, let us know." If you want anything, just raise your hand, or call Dr. Killinger. If you want money, call Dr. Beto, Director of the Texas Department of Corrections. This would be my advice to you.

I came to Sam Houston exactly three years and two months ago. The first thing I found on my desk was an edict from the Texas Legislature; "Be it Resolved that Sam Houston State College, because of its close proximity to the Department of Corrections, should investigate the feasibility of adopting and implementing a program in Criminology." Well, I read the thing and I thought, "How do you do a feasibility study on something like this?" So, they gave me a whole lot of money. They gave me $25,000 a year, for two years. We cut across all the corners and through all the red tape, and got some courses approved; we also used basic Sociology courses, and others that were already approved. We were fortunate to get Dr. Killinger to head this effort, and we began to recruit staff. We started the program. The first two years, the State gave us $50,000. This past year we were cited by the Legislature for the excellence of the program, and they really were benevolent. They gave us $150,000.

It might interest you to know, those of you who do not already know, that it costs about $5,000,000 to start a new doctoral program. It costs much more than $200,000 a year to run our undergraduate and masters program. We are trying to make this a practical program. I am devoted and dedicated to the proposition of developing here a program based on reality. We are interested in training people for all aspects of the world of correction, from the juvenile services all the way through to pre-release programs. I think that we read too much and theorize too much; we have done too little about practical problems. We are very fortunate here to be located in the same city with the Department of Corrections, and more fortunate to have Dr. George Beto, Director of Texas Department of Corrections. He is one of the few people in the nation with whom a theory and practice relationship could be established, such as we have here at Sam Houston.

We are interested in research projects — we are already undertaking them. We want to know what happens to the person who has committed a crime, who has been sentenced, and who has served his time. We don't think that all of them go out to rob banks and kill people. We do not find many studies where large groups of released prisoners have been followed up. We want to know about the parolee. How well does he melt back into society? The parolee who doesn't melt back into society successfully—what happened to him? What caused it? We are doing studies on these questions.

We have been fortunate again in that Dr. Beto was awarded the money to establish a computer center. With the two centers tied together, and with the Diagnostic Unit nearby, we feel that we will be able to research many, many things about the causes of crime. We hope also not only to do the research, but to come up with some recommendations that, can go, for example, to the public schools, back as far as the fourth grade where delinquent traits begin to show up. We want to present a program that will help correct some of the things that are happening in this country.

Our Institute has been successful because of Dr. Killinger, because of his staff, and because of the tremendous cooperation we have had from the Department of Corrections. Dr. Beto and I sit down and talk about our problem. If we have a problem, we solve it by ourselves. We don't appoint a committee, and we don't fool with it. We solve the problem, and get on with the program. I think if we have any success here, it will be because of this tremendous cooperation.

I sincerely hope that you will leave any suggestions you have for the improvement of this program. We're not the least bit thin-skinned about being told that we're doing something wrong. This is not our business. Neither Dr. Killinger nor I confine ourselves to four walls, and avoid all criticism. We get it. We don't always enjoy it, but we're able to live with it, and we try to develop a constructive program. Please give us any suggestions you have for the improvement of our program. We want them, and we need them.

Again it is a pleasure to have you in deep east Texas, the most beautiful part of Texas. This is the fall season. We don't have the beautiful maple leaves of Vermont, or the beautiful woods of Colorado. But we do have our own native East Texas. We think it's pretty, and we hope that you do too. I call this the "poverty-pocket" of Texas, especially the college end of it. Dr. Beto is more fortunate. He's a better provider for his institution. I call it being a better "lobbyist", but he calls it being "a better provider for his institution." It would have been better to have had this

Conference over in the more affluent section of our community. But you are welcome to the "poverty unit." We hope that your stay will be happy, and let us know if we can do anything for you.

GEORGE G. KILLINGER, Ph.D.

I'm sure you can see why it is easy to run a program such as we have at Sam Houston with backing of a president like Dr. Templeton. As he says, his door is always open, and we can always go talk with him, and we don't have to go through committees and wait a long time for an answer.

Every state has a director of corrections. But we are uniquely fortunate having not only a great prison administrator in Texas, but we have a man who understands the dynamics of delinquent behavior, who recognizes the importance of professional training for his staff, and who has made available to this Institute of ours, through every possible facility and financial support, every possible opportunity for our students to apply academic training in a practical correctional setting. He has backed us on every turn and has served as our advisor and consultant in every step of this program and in our curriculum planning. Without his experience, training and keen advice, plus his constant cooperation, our program would be shallow.

It is with great pleasure that I present to you one of America's most admired penologists, our friend, Dr. George Beto.

GEORGE J. BETO, Ph.D.

DIRECTOR OF TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Thank you, Dr. Killinger. Don't let Dr. Templeton throw that smoke screen on this money. I stand in holy awe of him over at the legislature when it comes to lobbying. Usually, after the last gavel has been sounded, Corrections, the step-child among agencies, sweeps up the crumbs that have fallen from higher education's table. Don't listen to him. I still don't know why they gave us a computer. Somebody goofed over there. Normally they aren't that generous with us.

I welcome you here on behalf of the Texas Department of Corrections, and I want to pay tribute particularly to the men who are responsible for the practical planning of this conference: Dr. Killinger, Mr. Weisenhorn, Mr. W. Dee Kutach, from our staff, Assistant Director for Treatment, Warden Sanders from the Pre-Release Unit, and Mr. Clark, his associate. Any professional benefits you receive, as well as the enjoyment of the social aspect of this Conference, are largely due to the work of these men. I think they have done an outstanding job in planning.

Dr. Templeton referred to the cooperative program between Sam Houston and the Department of Corrections. I think this is one of the finest marriages I have ever witnessed. I'm always agreeably surprised in my own mind when I reflect on the progress we have made. Having worked for twenty some years in educational institutions and institutions of higher learning, I know how slow change occurs. I don't believe there is anybody more conservative than the administration and staff of an educational institution. We originally envisioned a program of professional training and pre-service training for the Department of Corrections, as well as research. In a period of three short years, with a minimum expenditure of money, all of those objectives, to a degree, have been reached. I suspect the greater benefit -- I know, the greater benefit — as the result of this program has accrued to the Department of Corrections than has accrued to Sam Houston. We have been the real benefactors. It is a tribute to the work of Dr. Killinger, with the cooperation of Dr. Templeton, the support of the legislature, and the willingness of our people to cooperate that we have achieved the success that we've had.

It is a pleasure to be here this morning. Thank you.

GEORGE G. KILLINGER, Ph.D.

At this time there are just a few persons that I would like to recognize and thank for all the hard work they have done in bringing us this program. If you have not yet met him, I would like to ask Warden T. C. Sanders, from the Pre-Release Center of the Texas Department of Corrections at Richmond, Texas, to stand up. We speak about the "hostess with the mostest", but by the end of the week, you're going to feel that Mr. Sanders is the "host with the most". He has planned all of our evening entertainment for us. Also, Mr. Dee Kutach, the Associate Director for Treatment of the Texas Department of Corrections. Mr. Kutach has handled all of the housing, so you had a place to sleep last night. Don Weisenhorn, my associate is at the back of the room. Many of you have talked to Don on the phone. He has worked diligently throughout this whole thing.

I would like to recognize Mr. Leo Jenkins of the Pre-Release Center at Canon City, Colorado. Would he please stand. Mr. Jenkins came all the way to Huntsville for a planning meeting, and he has been with us throughout all the program development, and we thank him for coming back again. An old friend of mine, Warden J. E. Baker, of New Mexico, formerly of the Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. I used to say that Warden Baker was the father of pre-release, and I still have a manual that he wrote on pre-release years ago while he was the associate warden at the Lewisburg Penitentiary in Pennsylvania. Mr. Baker has been with us in this entire program planning and has been most helpful. Dr. John Twomey of Southern Illinois University was not able to be here, but helped in arranging this program by long distance, and fortunately he has sent to us a former student of mine and a friend, Dr. George Camp, who is now the associate warden at the new penitentiary at Marion, Illinois. George just got his Ph.D. from Yale and wrote a very interesting dissertation on bank robbery. It will soon be in publication as a book. I would also like to recognize Mr. William E. Flannigan, of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department in Washington. Mr. Flannigan is going to be our resource consultant and has flown down from Washington and is well informed in the whole area of corrections and correctional research.

I would like to mention Mr. Wint Hughes, the supervisor of pre-release from the programming section for the state of Wisconsin. Mr. Hughes at the last minute was not able to come. He has worked closely with all of us in this program and we regret that he will not be here.

Before we go further, I would like to have this opportunity to present to you briefly my extremely able faculty here at the Institute. We have, I feel, one of the strongest faculties of our type anywhere in the country. While some of them are not able to be here this morning because they do teach, I would like for the persons who are available to please stand after I have told you something of the areas which they cover.

Mr. J. D. McLeod is an associate professor, who covers the area of minority groups and race relations, and he doubles in brass in many of our general areas.

Dr. Beverly Bradbury, one of our newer members, is a specialist in psychopathy, and has studied the psychopath extensively. She also teaches our courses in the area of testing in corrections, dynamics of delinquent behavior, understanding human behavior. This general area I also cover since we are both psychologists.

Mr. Phil Morris is in the area of social welfare administration and introduction to social welfare. We are attempting to upgrade the undergraduate offerings in Social Services. Mr. Morris also teaches principles of sociology and basic courses in social problems.

Next, I would like to introduce to you Dr. Charles Friel, our research director. Dr. Friel came to us from Cornell Medical School and The Catholic University of America and recently has completed a contract with NASA in Houston in research. He has many research projects going for us at this moment. I might say that Dr. Friel has an unusual job in that, as you may not know, we have centers in Houston and Dallas and Dr. Friel at the moment is attempting to teach advanced Social Statistics to a Dallas class of 42 masters candidates. My hat is off to anyone who can teach a class of 42 students in statistics — that's a real job. But he's at least helping them to the stage where they will be writing master's theses, all of which we hope will be publishable material.

Mr. Robert Van Burkleo is in the area of cultural anthropology, as well as principles of sociology, and social problems.

Mr. Lowell Mayrant is in the area of criminology, social problems, and industrial sociology.

Mr. John Wodarski is a psychiatric social worker and M.S.W. He teaches in the area of social case work and interviewing techniques. He is a new and very able addition to our faculty.

Here we concentrate on three major areas of the correctional continuum — law enforcement, institutional corrections and criminology, and probation and parole. We also prepare students for careers in the juvenile court and for court services. At this time I would like to introduce to you Professor Ralph Anderson in charge of Police Science and Administration. Professor Anderson comes to us from the New York City Police Department where he was in charge of communications. He was also a Colonel in the U. S. Air Force, in charge of intelligence and security. He teaches in the area of public and private security, criminalistics, and operates our crime laboratory.

This morning I'm sorry to say that Professor Harry Caldwell is not here. Mr. Caldwell, who teaches for us on a half time basis, heads the Community Relations Section of the Houston Police Department, and the Police Academy in Houston. He teaches police administration and police problems and practices, teaching both at the Houston center and on campus here. Mr. Caldwell is a very able instructor and a great addition to our faculty.

Mr. Don Weisenhorn you've met earlier. Mr. Weisenhorn is in the area of criminology and juvenile delinquency, and he also serves as my assistant. He does a lot of liason throughout the state and participates in many conferences and seminars.

Last but not least, I would like to present to you the legal member of our faculty, Dr. Hazel Bowman Kerper, who has a degree in criminology as well as in law. Mrs. Kerper has an extensive background: she also has great strength in research. She teaches the legal aspects of law enforcement, legal aspects of corrections, and also does a great deal of work in group dynamics.

I teach in the general area of probation and parole, dynamics of delinquent behavior, and correctional administration.

In order to meet the demands from Dr. Templeton and Dr. Beto's employees, we have school on this campus every night from seven o'clock till ten in addition to our day offerings. We also have classes in Houston, Dallas, and Beaumont. At this time we have 1603 students at the undergraduate level. We have 137 candidates for the master's degree. So, with that background, I would like to move into our program.

11

HALFWAY HOUSE PROGRAMS — A NATIONAL OVERVIEW

O. J. KELLER, Jr.

DIRECTOR OF DIVISION OF YOUTH SERVICES
STATE OF FLORIDA — TALLAHASSEE

People are surprised when I talk about Halfway Houses for juveniles. They generally think that kids can return to homes, sad as they are. Another reason you don't think of halfway houses for juveniles particularly is that a lot of people don't like working with adolescents. If you've ever read Freidenburg's book **The Vanishing Adolescents,** you know there are a lot of people who just don't like teenagers. When you couple "teenage" with "delinquency", you've got kind of an "onery" character on your hands. A lot of people just don't want to meddle with a teenage delinquent child. They're tough business. I think they're harder to handle in many cases than the adult convicts who at least, no matter what they are thinking inside, are more inclined to go along with the program. And finally, I think one reason people may have stayed away from the halfway houses for juveniles is that you think of a halfway house as being a short term experience. But unless you really do some planning, it turns out to be a long term experience. You take a fourteen or fifteen year old boy, and you put him in a halfway house, what are you going to do with him at the end of six months? You can't move him into military service. Lots of times you can't find a foster home for someone that age. What starts out to be a short term business — well, the child may be there a couple of years.

Where are most halfway houses located? The ones that I've seen, most of them are located in the metropolitan areas. Some halfway houses for probationers are located in semi-rural areas. These are the houses I've seen in New York and New Jersey for kids who are at the probation level. They are located in semi-rural areas for a deliberate reason. They want to control the kids' associations so that they can build a group culture within the halfway house. There is a lot of contact with the free community. But at the same time, by having the halfway house let's say, maybe a mile or two outside of a small town, they do control the contacts that the child has with outside people. But most of the halfway houses I've seen, certainly those for parolees, are located in transitional

12

neighborhoods of metropolitan areas.

Why do you locate them in transitional areas? After all, these are all the decaying areas. If you visit, let's say, St. Leonard's House — which is not a halfway house for kids, but it sure is in a decaying area — it's a hell of a section of Chicago. It's really a slum area. There are some pretty good reasons for putting a halfway house in a transitional area. One is that you don't get any public reaction. I mean these neighborhoods are so generally shook up that if you locate a halfway house for convicts in one of these deteriorated sections, nobody complains. They just accept it. Another good reason for having a halfway house in the inner-city is that the convicts who are in the halfway house come from the metropolitan areas. They come from the inner-city. So does this make sense? Instead of putting this person off in the country someplace, put him back in the city, and try to help him work with his problems in the city.

Another good reason for having the halfway house in the inner-city area is because it's closer to schools, and work, and the community resources involved, and on the main transportation lines. I think another good reason, too, is that if you have had a man in a halfway house, and the program has benefitted him, and he leaves the halfway house, and isn't making it after two or three months on the outside back with his family, the halfway house is still close enough that he can get back to it. He can come back for a little moral support or reassurance from the staff, or maybe from other residents. Also, if the halfway house is in the transitional area, you can get the families involved, and you can't do that if it's way out in the country.

Finally, a reason that a friend of mine in Boston came up with which I think is a pretty good one, is that if you have the halfway house in an inner-city area, it's not as easy for the community to duck responsibility. It's right there. If you put the place out in the country, to some extent it might be "out of sight, out of mind." If you have it in the city, you can see that the Kiwanis Club or the Exchange Club, or the Community Chest people come over for lunch and say to them, "See what we are doing. Meet the residents, Don't be fearful."

Very often, of course, these halfway houses are old mansions. What a break for a real-estate guy. Here he is in a transitional area, and he has a place like St. Leonard's House on his hands, which was one of those grand old houses in Chicago years ago. It's a great big white elephant as far as people are concerned. It's a great big old house, perfect though for a halfway house, and many of them are of this description. You think of Robert Bruce's house in Newark, that's an old mansion; St. Leonards house, that's an old mansion; Shaw House, the Shaw residence in Washington, D.C., it's an old mansion; etc.

One of the interesting halfway houses, though that's not an old mansion, is what the New York Division for Youth has for teenagers. They have apartment complexes, which intrigue me. They have put six to seven delinquent kids in middle class apartment buildings. The kids told me about it. They said the people, the neighbors, didn't like it too much. When they first moved in, when they knew that these little crooks were in the building, people were really giving the creeps to these kids. These kids in this one place that I went to, an apartment in the Bronx, they said the way they overcame it was when they would be standing in the hallway, you know, next to these frozen people who were also getting into the elevators, the kids would be the ones who would say "good morning." They just made the older people break down. The kids were actually conducting themselves okay, and they broke down some of that opposition.

How about the YMCA locations? There's a lot of pros and cons on whether you should put the halfway house in a YMCA. Well here are some of the reasons for using a YMCA. First of all, it's not a separate facility. People say, "Look, why do you have to take these guys and isolate them in a separate building?" So people say, "Why don't you put them in the YMCA the existing facility, where they can fit right in with other people?" Okay, that's a pretty good reason. Be part of the free world, in other words. Also — this is a very good reason — you don't have any capital expense. You want to get that halfway house going, make your deal with the guy at the YMCA and say, "Look, give us so many rooms. We want to move some men in." Speaking of rooms, by the way, most of the people that I've talked to that have halfway houses in the YMCA say, "Don't scatter your people throughout the Y. You may think that you're making these men anonymous, but you're not. People still know they're there. You'll have better control of them if you have a block of rooms." Jerry Collins may not agree with me and he's going to speak to you — he's with the Federal system. He used to be in charge of the pre-release center in Kansas City, Missouri.

14

They have their guys scattered throughout the YMCA in Kansas City. But some of the other places I've been to, they've tried it, and they don't like it. They would rather have them in a block of rooms.

Another reason for using the YMCA is you have a wonderful recreation program there. You have a swimming pool, you have dances, you have card parties, and so on. You don't have any food problems, you have a cafeteria there. You don't have to worry about cleaning up the dishes. You don't have any housekeeping problems. I remember talking to one man who was strong for using the YMCA. He said, "Look, why should a guy go out and work all day, and then come back to a place and have to clean up the 'john'? Why should he have to clean up the darn bathroom, you know, when he comes home from work?" We can avoid housecleaning chores by moving into the YMCA.

Here's the arguments against the YMCA. Here's the other side of the coin. They are often in the deteriorated skid-row sections — your downtown Y's. You take the Wabash YMCA in Chicago. Boy, it's right down there on South State Street and South Wabash, in a slum area with all the bars and girlie shows.

One of the reasons it's a little bit risky, particularly if you are working with younger men at the YMCA, is that the YMCAs are often the homo hangouts, which is too bad. But you do have homosexuals who are living in there, and it isn't that our kids are all angels, but a lot of these young men are hustlers, or have hustled now and then. You do bring them into contact with men who stay forever in YMCAs and homosexuality, unfortunately, is often a problem with residential YMCAs.

We have also often been told that the staff of the YMCAs are either overly sympathetic with the residents feeling sorry for them, or they are overly critical. That's the one I've heard most of the time. Anytime anything goes wrong in the YMCA, it's those darn guys in the halfway house that did it.

And finally, the fact that the YMCA does have everything can make your men overly-dependent. If you have a YMCA hotel that has dances right there, and a library, and a swimming pool, and a restaurant, these guys, if they are fearful about getting into the community, they hardly have to leave the building.

Let's talk a little bit about public relations. If you put your halfway house in a transitional neighborhood, you won't have many problems. It isn't because the lower income people in that transitional neighborhood like you better, it's just that they're disorganized. They can't really get that old middle class "go-go-go" stuff. If you want to put your halfway house in a middle class area, look out — the middle class will be after you, generally speaking. I mean, you know, there will be a doctor on the block or a lawyer on the block, who will say, "This is terrible. We've got a contagious disease coming in here. We've got to get together. Let's sign the petition. Let's go to the city fathers. Let's get an attorney." And so on. The interesting thing to me though, is that where halfway houses are willing to fight it out, they generally win.

Take the Watkinson House for instance. Watkinson House is a halfway house for cons in Hartford, Connecticut. What they did was to buy the residence first of all. Then before the announcement was made to the public, they attempted to sort of sell the neighbors. They went to the people who lived in the block, and there were 59 families that they tried to call on. They called on half of them. They said, "Look, here's what we're trying to do. Work with us. These guys aren't going to ruin the property. It's going to be all right."

The neighbors did band together. They weren't persuaded. They were fearful. They signed a petition, they went down town. They just raised cain about it. They demonstrated with banners. and placards around City Hall. They had a heck of a time. The lower court decided against Watkinson House. But Watkinson House took the issue to the Supreme Court of Connecticut. The Supreme Court of Connecticut said, "You can open. We understand the fears of the neighbors, but there is no tangible evidence that there's going to be any harm done by these people. Until there is, the place can function." And it is functioning to this day.

You'll be interested to know, by the way, that Crofton House in San Diego, which has a big research team, or at least has a research team connected with it, did some research on what happens in the neighborhood. The questions were: "Does crime go up where halfway houses are located?" Another question was, "Do property values go down?" The answer, and they really checked it out carefully, in both instances is, "no". There is no increase in crime in the halfway house vicinity. There is no decline in property values.

Here are some of the other places that have had problems where the neighbors have tried to knock them out and yet the halfway house won. Silverlake, which is a halfway house for teenagers in Los Angeles, in a middle class neighborhood. People complained. People went to the city council. The city council supported the halfway house, and said "It can stay."

In Richmond, California, there is a non-residential center called GUIDE. It's run by Contra Costa County Probation Department. It's a non-residential center. This means that the girls who come to this halfway house show up about eight o'clock in the morning. They're in a school program or work program all day long, and they go home to their own folks late in the evening. Some of these non-residential centers (we'll mention them in a minute) are a pretty good idea. But the neighbors tried to knock them out. Again, the city council said, "No. It's okay, they can stay."

Topeka, Kansas was another place. First of all, they tried to do it the right way. The chief probation officer went around and contacted first one group of potential neighbors, and said, "Look, these are basically dependent boys." The neighbors weren't buying it, and said, "No, stay out." He went to three different locations, and the third time he figured he had it. He just bought the house for $20,000.00. He said, "Now, see what you can do." So they took it to the city council; they (the neighbors) tried to throw it out. The city council decided in favor of the Topeka, Kansas halfway house. Furthermore, it said, "You can put a halfway house anywhere, in any neighborhood in Topeka."

Dorchester, Massachusetts, has a halfway house for women coming out of the Framingham Reformatory for Women, and the neighbors were up in arms, you know, terrible, going to ruin everything. The board of directors of the halfway house fought back. Some people say, "Don't get in a public fight. You'll get hurt. Play it cool. Don't get in the papers. Don't get on radio. Don't get on television." The people in Dorchester, Massachusetts didn't play it that way. They did get on television. They got in touch with the newspaper people and said, "Come take pictures." They organized a bus trip for the neighbors. They said, "Do you want to meet the people who are going to come to this place? Come on out there, get in the bus. We'll visit out at Framingham. We'll meet some of the people." Their opposition fell to pieces. The same thing has happened to halfway houses for narcotics addicts. They have tried to kick them out of California a number of times, down at Long Beach. They are still there. Now it is true that Synanon was forced out of a place in Westport, Connecticut, but it wasn't because it was a halfway house. It was because that kind of building was against the zoning regulations for that particular area.

Pros and cons on advanced notice: You may have seen that little booklet they put out for the Conference on Corrections in Stockholm a couple of years ago. It was called *TRENDS*. Their recommendation is to advise the people that you are coming. But don't do it too long in advance, you will get the old opposition organized against you and make it difficult. So, give them the information but not too much ahead of time.

I'm pretty strong for an advisory committee. I think that if you are going to have a halfway house, it is a good idea to have some of your important people in the community on your advisory committee. Let me give you an example: The Ernie Davis Youth Home, is a halfway house for kids under the jurisdiction of the Division For Youth, Syracuse, New York. They have about thirty boys. They have an advisory committee. After they had been in business for several months in Syracuse, New York, one of their boys was exploring an abandoned building with a teenage girl. Just a couple of teenagers, whom I do not think were doing anything wrong, except they were in a building that they were not supposed to be in, and they were tramping around inside it. A tragic accident happened. There was an old skylight inside this building, which had been painted over, and the girl, thinking she was stepping on solid footing, stepped right through the glass and fell to her death, about four stories down. There was no adverse community reaction. As for the reason that there wasn't was because the advisory committee was cut in on what had happened. They were aware of the circumstances, and there were people in the community who knew what buttons to push. It was not that they were covering anything, but it was that they knew the truth of the matter.

I wish to mention a little about the non-residential centers. I mentioned the guidance center in Richmond, California, which is a non-residential center. Some of these places make sense particularly for the young people. There are a lot who live at home but they must report at 7:00 or 8:00 o'clock in the morning, and then they are there all day for a program of one type or another.

What are the arguments for non-residential centers? Well, for one thing, there is low cost. It is less expensive. If you do not have to have a place that has sleeping quarters, if you do not have kitchen facilities, then you do not have to have as much staff, and it is not going to cost you as much.

Another very good reason, I think for the non-residential center, (this has come out in research,) is that you have some people who if you put them in a halfway house, cannot take the pressure, particularly some of these group homes that I have seen, the ones where they have deliberately built up a group culture in the center. But you take a newcomer, and you deliberately throw him into a halfway house where they have an established group culture, by that I mean where the kids in the halfway house are actually going along with the staff, where you do not have that old split between the staff on one hand and the kids on the other, or the inmates on the other. You actually have the staff and the residents of the halfway house sold on the same basic values. If you turn a delinquent into a residential situation like that, sometimes he cannot take the pressures. He will run. Few run from non-residential centers. If a person can go home at night, he can, so-to-speak, escape the pressure.

Here are the arguments for the residential center. If you are attempting to have a halfway house for probationers, and you are attempting to change value systems, and you want to build up this group culture, the feeling of common concern, and each person helping one another, (it is sort of like an alcoholics anonymous), you can build your group culture much quicker and much more strongly if you have a residential center because you are controlling the association of your residents.

How good are halfway houses? There has been very little careful research on it. For one thing, the halfway houses that are private don't generally have the money. They need every penny they can get just to make the halfway house function. So halfway houses do not really know how well they are doing in most cases. Much of the research (by this I mean careful research) that has been done, has been done on halfway houses for youthful offenders at the probation level who are using guided group interaction. For instance, one has been researched twice. It was researched several years ago and has been researched very carfully rceently by Rutgers University. The guided group interaction in San Francisco is being carefully researched. The Southfields program in Kentucky which is guided group interaction is also being studied.

Halfway houses are not an answer for everybody unless they face unpleasant facts. In many halfway houses there are high in-program failure rates. That means that people are sent to the halfway houses and they do not make it. They don't complete the program. They either get sent back to the institution because they are considered not suitable for the program, or they run away. Southfield's, for instance — which is a halfway house for youthful probationers (these are young people about seventeen, eighteen, nineteen years of age) — in the first four years of their operation they had a 48 percent failure rate in their program. Forty-eight percent of their young people who came in did not finish. Silverlake in Los Angeles — the one referred to before — it has a 50 percent failure rate. The seven Michigan halfway houses, under the department of Social Welfare in Michigan, John Miller who is the head of that program, admitted that their halfway houses for youthful parolees have a program failure rate of 45 percent.

The Pre-Release Guidance Centers of the Federal Government have also researched their failure rate.

The pre-release centers have a pretty good grip over people because the guy who is in a pre-release center knows that he is not on parole yet. He knows that if he were not in that pre-release center in Chicago, or Houston, or Oakland, California, or New York, he would be in prison. But even then, the in-program failure rate for the Federal system has been between 20 and 30 percent.

The parolee, on the other hand may have a very different view point. His idea is "leave me alone, man. I have done my time. I don't want to be in this. The only reason I am in your lousy halfway house in the first place is because I have no place else to go. I have no friends, no family, but all I want is a job, a place to sleep, and do not try to involve me in treatment because I am not interested." You run into that in a lot of parolee halfway houses.

On measuring the effectiveness of a program, do you count the in-program failures? If they have somebody who comes into a halfway house and he gets sent back to prison, do they count him as a failure when they are deciding whether the program is successful or not? The answer generally, is that they do not. They only count the people who complete the program.

It is tough to do careful research regarding halfway houses. Here are some of the reasons: Particularly at the probation level, you try to make a deal with the judge. You say, "Now judge, we are trying to research this program to see how good it is. We need your cooperation." They had a swell judge out in Provo, Utah, who was very interested in that halfway house they used to have. The one called Pine Hills. They said, "Now judge, here we are going to give you a couple of envelopes and you take these kids who fit this basic description, and you just put them in here and we are going to have random assignments. If this boy goes into the industrial school, then that boy goes to Pine Hills. And the other boy goes on probation. Will you do that judge?" The judge could not do it. He got that young person in front of him in court and talked to the boy and said, "That boy is going to Pine Hills." And that just blew it.

Well, take for instance at the McLaren Center which is in Oregon. Amos Reed and his group in Oregon reported that they were supposed to have random assignments either to a regular parole program or to the McLaren Vocational Center. The people at the institution who have been working with that boy said, "Wait a minute, we don't go for this random assignment business. We have plans for this boy. We've been working with him here at the institution. We don't want this kid to be randomly assigned. You want to negate all of our work for the last few months." So random assignment has often been pretty tough in a halfway house.

Then, what have they done when they can't get random assignment? What they tried to do was to match a kid according to variables. That's what Dr. Stevenson did at Rutgers. In other words, they try to figure what variables are important: age, social economic background, IQ, delinquent history, etc. Most of the researchers have been honest enough to admit, that generally, despite the fact that they try to match everyone up according to these variables, the best boys still go on probation, and the worst still go to the reformatory. So that's not very satisfactory sometimes.

Finally, one thing of interest is that, when you have a research program, you often find out that the research program interferes with operations. Start to measure a program as it is in Crofton House in San Diego. Then here's the researchers with an office in the next adjoining building. As time passes the people running Crofton House say, "How are we doing?" And the researchers say, "We can't tell you."

"What do you mean, you can't tell us? Are we helping people?"

"We're objective, we're standing back, we're dispassionate, we're going to observe your program."

Well, what happened was that the people got very unfriendly towards one another. The operations staff was made uneasy about this due to the fact that they were being observed. Their argument was, "If we're doing something wrong, tell us." And the research team will say, "We can't do that, because then, we change things. We don't want to change things, we want to tell you six months from now whether you are doing it right or not." What they finally did, interesting enough in the Crofton houses, they gave up. The research people went ahead and told the operations people when they should make some changes. This way they'd have a better program. But some people would say, "Look what this has done to research."

I think one of the problems in researching the halfway houses in the United States is that recidivism has been the prime measure. In other words, the thing they're always interested in knowing is when a person gets out on parole, after he leaves the halfway house, does he fail later in the community? And then they judge halfway houses on whether they have a high failure rate in the community. I think it is too bad, and I would say this generally for the corrections field. If you have a good program at the halfway house, or in the reformatory, and you think you have helped an inmate, and then you release that inmate and there is no continuity of treatment, you simply drop him. You say, "Put your blinders on, go straight and narrow, be a good person from here on, follow the middle class value system, be like us, it's going to be okay." And you send him right back to the slums of Chicago or New York. If your parole program is like most, you don't really have very close supervision. How can people really believe that the program, let's say at six months or four months or ten months at a halfway house is going to be so terrific, particularly for a young person who has to return to his original home area, and forever walk the straight line? No wonder they fail. I think that until you have continuity of treatment, you're really not going to have proper assessment of some of these programs' effectiveness.

Let's consider if recidivism is the measure, how good are these halfway houses? The pre-release guidance centers of the federal government, (and I'm going to stay off those mainly because Jerry Collins is going to talk to you about those), through 1965 research studies by the Bureau of Prisons show that those who completed the program and went out into the community had a 30 percent failure rate, which was just like the institution releasee. It wasn't any better than the people who were coming out of the institutions. I referred to Crofton House in San Diego. Did their people do any better than those coming out of the Institutions? The people living at Crofton House in San Diego, were all misdemeanant people. They either went to jail, or an honor camp, or to Crofton House. Crofton House discovered that their people didn't do any better than the honor camp people.

East Los Angeles halfway house for narcotic addicts has folded. I don't think it was a very good program. If you've ever read Gilbert Geis's research report on that, it doesn't look like a very good program. It looks like all they did was to transform the correctional institution to the community. It sounded like a pretty authoritarian program. But at any rate, these resident's didn't do any better than the control group.

What about the New Jersey study? Well, the New Jersey study measured 1200 young men, and I'm referring to people about the ages of 17, 18, 19, and 20, who were assigned either to the 3 residential centers for probationers in New Jersey, or to the 9 residential centers, (one called Essexfield), or to the reformatory, or to probation. What did they find out? After completing the program, those placed in the halfway houses and in the residential centers had a 41 percent failure rate. For Essexfield, the non-residential center, there was a 48 percent failure rate, and of course the one that came up looking like Stinky Davis was the reformatory. They had a 53 percent failure rate.

What are some of the apparent conclusions from all this stuff. Well, probation looks pretty good. For instance, in the New Jersey study, they had only a 15 percent failure rate. But

23

then you need an asterisk; and then you need to look at the bottom of the page, because Dr. Stevenson admits that the end program failure rate for probation, in other words where the probation officer says, "I can't work with this kid, get rid of him," was the highest of all of them. They had the highest failure rate of people who were still in programming. Those who completed probation and then were furloughed in the community they had the lowest failure rate.

Probation also looked good with respect to Southfield and Provo. There were also experimental and control groups until the control groups were probationers. But again, the researchers had missed. The probationers were generally the better candidates.

Halfway houses are not the answer for everybody, that's for sure. The Bureau of Prisons found out, interestingly enough, in their first research, that some of the people who ought to do well — you know, generally when you start a halfway house you take quote, "your best bets", because you don't want any adverse community action — you take the guys you think are going to do best in the community. The Bureau of Prisons discovered that a lot of the guys who should have done well, failed.

Silverlake, the halfway house in Los Angeles, came up with an interesting finding, which was that the people who often fail in halfway houses were not the most criminal; and they were not the most delinquent. Silverlake discovered that the people who weren't making it at Silverlake were the unpopular ones. This was the kid that the other kids didn't like. "Like man, get away from me, you smell." The people who did well at Silverlake were the people who were confirmed delinquents. They were popular and they did fine in the halfway house.

I don't think halfway houses should be thought of as a panacea. They shouldn't replace good probation or good parole work. I think that halfway houses can well be used for probation failures, and according to the New Jersey research, it looks as though halfway houses are excellent, particularly for hard core delinquents, or hard core offenders. Don't forget that non-residential centers may be your best bet, in some cases, rather than a residential center.

What are some of the arguments in behalf of the halfway houses? One of them is, why should a halfway house be expected to have a low failure rate? If you're just going to put the very best people in halfway houses so that you have a low failure rate, why have halfway houses? What's the point? If it is only for the best risks, who needs it? What they're doing now in the federal system is using a base expectancy table, which I think is an interesting thing. What they've done is this; they have attempted to give offenders ratings based upon certain variables of base expectancy scores. And they did discover this, (which was an argument in favor of the halfway house), for a man who would have a 52 percent failure rate according to the base expectancy scores; they only failed 42 percent. So they said, "Considering the men we're working with, this was pretty good, wasn't it?" I would agree that I was.

Some of the other arguments for halfway houses are as follows: If a man is in the community and is working, he is not a drag on society. He may be supporting his family. It may be possible to help keep a family together if a man is in the community where he has access to his relatives.

Finally, and this point from Glaser (which I think is a good one); you have guys who fail; and you have a high in-program failure rate. Actually, this may be a break for the community because you have a closer supervision of a man in a halfway house than you would ever have on regular program of probation or parole. If the staff in the halfway house realizes that this man isn't going to make it; then you should send him back. It doesn't mean that the halfway house program is no good; It may mean that the community itself has benefitted.

O. S. Keller, Jr., left, Director Florida Division of Child Training Schools, Tallahassee, Florida, and George J. Beto, Ph.D., Director, Texas Department of Corrections.

THE EVOLVING PROGRAM OF A PRIVATELY OPERATED HALFWAY HOUSE

REVEREND ROBERT P. TAYLOR

DIRECTOR OF ST. LEONARD'S HOUSE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Saint Leonard's House is a Center for work in corrections sponsored by the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago. The portion of our work with which we are most widely identified is that which offers the services of a halfway house to ex-offenders. This service was our original work, out of which the rest developed and it is still basic to our work. However, the halfway house is by no means the full extent of the activity of Saint Leonard's House as a community treatment center for offenders. We are now looking beyond this mode of treatment into other areas among the unmet needs of ex-offenders.

The halfway house in corrections can be defined as a residenial facility used as a means of intervention in the life of the ex-prisoner as he makes his transition from the prison to the free community. The resident program of Saint Leonard's House, our halfway house, has focused for the past six years on the problems of the ex-penitentiary inmate leaving the penitentiary on parole. We house 21 men at a time and have dining facilities serving two meals a day (breakfast and dinner) family style. Ninety percent of our men are under supervision; only 15 percent are serving time for their first felony. Intake is a wholly voluntary matter and application is made directly by mail by the inmate. The average length of stay of a resident is 60 days, though looking at our outcome data, we feel that the optimum length of stay is between 60 and 90 days.

The resident of a halfway house is making the transition from the status of inmate to the status of citizen. In the former status he enjoyed an almost totally dependent relationship with the institution and bore very little responsibility for either his behavior or his survival. As a citizen he will be required to exercise a considerable degree of independence and will be held responsible for both. This transition covers a wide range of problems and the attainment, step-by-step, of a series or system of both short-term and long-term goals. At Saint Leonard's House our methods include both individual and group counseling. We attempt to make use of the therapeutic processes generated by the interaction of staff and guests participating in a single community. There is, generally speaking, less freedom of movement in the early days of residence than in later days. There is some group self-determination in that some decisions regarding policy and procedure are made by the residents during a weekly house meeting and emphasis is placed in counseling on the decision-making process. The goals recommended for the termination of a course of residence are steady employment, evidence of financial responsibility and the ability to manage one's life, the resolution of crises and the beginning of constructive social relationships.

Saint Leonard's house was one of the four agencies visited by a team from the U. S. Bureau of Prisons in 1961. It was out of the work of that team that the Pre-release Guidance Center program of the Bureau of Prisons developed. Since that time the halfway house principle has been adapted into the correctional programs of a number of public and private agencies. Indeed there seems to be a genuine halfway house movement and we at Saint Leonard's House have been grateful for the opportunity to participate in it. At the same time we feel that there are some interesting hazards encountered at the brink of success. The private halfway house comes into being out of the need to compensate for the deficiencies of the system. If it conceives its role in terms of providing this service permanently those deficiencies will also remain permanent. We feel that some agencies have programmed themselves for failure and they are participating actively in the programming of a system of mediocrity.

In the spring of 1967, the Illinois legislature appropriated funds to the Department of Public Safety, which administers the State's correctional facilities, to establish both work release and halfway house programs under its jurisdiction. The plans are for a pilot project halfway house to be established in Chicago and in some downstate city. As that project gets underway, Saint Leonard's House will be modifying its approach in administering this kind of service. We are anxious not to duplicate any state service. Moreover, we see our role as being less in the form of direct service than in terms of developing innovative program which might have application and use by public agencies. Our long range objectives are to attempt to institute changes in the systems in which offenders and ex-offenders live. We use direct service as the concrete entry point for instituting this sort of change.

Let me give an example from our recent experience at Saint Leonard's House. In 1965 we established a method of working with female ex-offenders as non-residents. Our clients were, for the most part, parolees from Dwight Women's Reformatory. In the absence of an approved parole plan, a room was found in the vicinity of Saint Leonard's House. The client took her meals with us. She made use of the employment and counseling services of the House in making her transition to the free community. Within two years following the establishment of this distinct service offered by the agency, two kinds of changes were being observed. The first occurred inside the institutional structure. Prior to 1965 there was little release planning done with the inmate who was leaving the institution. When we began our project our staff man was deluged with requests and was regarded as the only person competent to manage this kind of counseling situation. In time he was able to orient the other chaplains, the institutional personnel and the parole division to a pattern of procedures that would use the resources available.

A similar phenomenon was observed at Saint Leonard's House. At the beginning of the project our work with women was regarded as a distinct and separate unit within the agency. In time, however, the staff of that project was able to train the rest of us to handle the peculiar problems of the female offender as distinct from problems experienced by male offenders. At the beginning of 1968, this project will be terminated. The services of Saint Leonard's House will be, by that time, available both to men and women who have served time. It was important that the project helped sixty women a year for three years. It was more important that the experience which the project gave us instituted changes both at Saint Leonard's House and within the system. In the long run, that project will have reached more people than if it had been conceived purely along the lines of continuing service. In similar fashion then, we find ourselves in a position of having to deal with the fact that our halfway house service has achieved its purpose. The halfway house principle is now being incorporated into the correctional system upon which we focused. This fact gives us some anxiety, but more importantly, it gives us freedom to move along into new areas and to attempt to develop new roles for ourselves. There are several areas in which we are already committed.

The first is a specialized problem with which we have had considerable experience. Narcotics addiction is one of the more vexing problems that correctional programs must deal with. In our experience of running an agency serving ex-offenders, we have found that 25 percent of our men and 75 percent of our women were also ex-addicts. Chicago has been for many years barren of any service specifically designed to assist the narcotics user. There has been a complete absence of medical services available to the addict in Chicago outside of those in a correctional institution. Saint Leonard's House has been funded by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity to develop a comprehensive narcotics rehabilitation project in the west side neighborhood in which we are located. The project will offer direct services, (social, medical, legal, psychotherapeutic, and vocational), to addicts and their families. The course of treatment for the drug addict in addition to traditional forms of direct service will involve orientation, detoxification from physical dependence in a hospital setting, assistance in reentering the community through a halfway house, intensive group therapy beginning with that re-entry stage, and intensive vocational rehabilitation including remedial education and training where indicated. Group therapy will be the core activity and will be conducted by trained ex-addict therapists who have been recruited from Daytop Village and Synanon Foundation. Drug therapy will be attempted with a small group of clients most probably using the methadone maintenance procedure developed by Drs. Dole and Nyswander in New York. An important factor in the project will be the training of indigenous ex-addict group therapists and one of the expected by-products by the end of the first year, will be the launching of a residential therapeutic community similar to Daytop Village away from Saint Leonard's House. This project is already underway, and as indicated, will make use of our halfway house facilities in addition to a good deal of our non-residential space.

The other projects which will make use of our resident facility are yet in process of development. Both of them are matters of serious discussion among the staff. Both will begin to be developed during the coming year. Neither will be fully formed for another two years. One of these is really a reversal of the normal use of the halfway house facility. Normally a halfway house assists men flowing out from the institution into the community. Their purpose is to offset the effects of institutionalism. The reverse use would involve the development of a group living situation, not for parolees or dischargees, but for probationers. The purpose of such a program would not be to offset the effects of institutionalism, but to attempt to prevent those effects by offering an alternative to the institution at the time of sentencing. The methods and procedures would be roughly the same although the character of the residential community would be quite different. Our experience, for example, is that the principle bond among our men is not the common experience of a criminal career but the common experience of having served time. It is for this reason that probationers referred at present to our resident program never seem quite to fit in. We do feel however, that the halfway **in** house as distinct from the halfway **out** house idea, has merit. We are already in conversation with several judges who are quite excited about such a project. Their excitement arises out of their frustration in having to sentence a "natural" for probation to a penitentiary sentence because of a total lack of resources in the community from which to draw.

The other project under consideration by our staff that will utilize the residents involves the training of ex-offenders in new careers in human service. This is an activity with which we already have some experience. Ex-offenders have been employed at Saint Leonard's House at every level. We are convinced that the penitentiaries contain pools of human resources that no one is at present utilizing. In the cybernetic age in which we live, jobs in production are declining in number, jobs in human service are increasing. Alcoholics Anonymous, Synanon, and Daytop Village and other self-help programs have demonstrated the rehabilitative effect upon the worker who attempts to help an individual who experiences problems that he (the worker) has overcome. There is an equally important effect upon the client in that the worker who has "been the route" offers a role model with whom the client can identify. And there is an effect on clinical processes in that many barriers to communication normally experienced by professionals in dealing with their clients are swept away. A member of our staff recently commented that what Saint Leonard's House needed was several million dollars to be used simply to employ ex-offenders in some responsible position. "This," he said, "would be the most effective rehabilitation program we could offer." He was perhaps over-reacting to the experience of observing the overnight growth in stature that was visible in the bearing and manner of a former client of our agency who had just been hired by us as a counselor. There are many problems involved in such a training program. Criteria for selection and for progress of the training process leading to promotion are terribly important. Simply employing a man without both training and supervision would be worse than no program as would be simply the offering of a job without attempting to develop real career lines. This latter problem, as well as the problem of confining the trained ex-offender rehabilitation worker to correctional work depends for its solution on changes in attitude throughout the human service field. We know that we can train persons holding master's degrees, not only in correctional agencies, but in other agencies as well. We are hopeful that social service administrators will become aware of the potential of our men as well as of the critical manpower shortage in the field of social work. We can conceive of the time (though at present we can't quite foresee it) when the operation of a training institute for ex-offenders would be the primary activity of Saint Leonard's House and when the operation of the halfway house would be secondary and would simply provide a clinic facility for the training process.

As the halfway house principle with which we began becomes completley incorporated into the public correctional systems in this country, it will be necessary for correctional agencies to look beyond them altogether. For the past two years, Saint Leonard's House has been in the process of developing a non-resident program. It is in part an outgrowth of the informal work which the staff has been doing approximately 300 persons a year. Some of these informal clients have been former residents needing follow-up assistance. Some of them are strangers whom we have met only once.

The goals of our non-resident program are to form the cachement area into which ex-offenders who are at large in the community can be drawn, and in which their problems can be surfaced and dealt with. What we have in mind, then, is a community social and social service center designed to serve not the geographical community in which we live, but the functional community composed of all ex-offenders in the Chicago area. Such a center will provide a recreation area, meeting rooms for small groups, and counseling space. Our intention in this program will be to provide a wide range of services and activities for the ex-prisoner.

The basic service involved in our non-resident program is counseling, both individual and group. The main activities of the counselor approximate those of detached workers, working with street gangs. Most participants in the center come for reasons other than direct counseling. The task of the counselor then is to penetrate the sub-culture of the center and to intervene, when he is able. By his intervention he attempts to confront the individual with the reality of his situation and encourages him to make the necessary decisions to insure his welfare. While the counselor may often function as a broker of social services available from agencies outside Saint Leonard's House, the center offers some forms of direct service itself. Employment is a pivotal problem in the life of the ex-offender, not because all he needs is a job, but because work and wages are the necessary pre-conditions of his adjustment to the free community. It is after these preconditions are satisfied that his real problems begin to emerge. The employment service is available to residents as well as non-residents. We have a full-time vocational counselor within the narcotics project.

Another important service is a legal aid clinic which we established a year ago in connection with the Church Federation, using twelve volunteer lawyers. We have had support from the Legal Aid Bureau which has provided resource staff weekly and we have uncovered a great many unmet legal needs of a civil nature among ex-offenders. Our lawyers have serviced an average of five clients per week during the past year.

Perhaps the most important service offered by the center, however, is merely an opportunity for association. We seriously question the wisdom of the long-standing parole sanction against association. We feel that it stifles a basic human need and that it is likely that more cases of recidivism are traceable to a lack of association than to its opposite. Our Non-Resident Program is still in the process of development. We look forward to the day when there might be a writer's workshop, a softball team, and even a stamp collecting club for ex-offenders who are interested. Harry Elmer Barnes commented years ago that the critical need of offenders and ex-offenders is probably not so much in terms of vocational training and development but in the area of the development of the constructive use of leisure time.

The private correctional agency located in the community offers a fascinating laboratory for the correctional field. The current vogue of halfway houses and pre-release programs can provide a tremendous impetus to their growth. This vogue presents, at the same time, an enormous danger to their development. They will fail the correctional field if they get hung up in the carrying on of their service programs into the indefinite future. They need assistance, the guidance, the direction and stimulation of the public agencies if they are to function effectively through their programs as gadflies. They need to be driven on toward new areas of experimentation and exploration, in order that they can best serve the public institutions which is, in the long run, their main function.

THE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM OF A HALFWAY HOUSE FOR NARCOTIC ADDICTS

KEITH TURKINTON

SUPERVISOR OF JOBS FOR YOUTH COUNSELORS
VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE SERVICE
HOUSTON, TEXAS

In order to accurately understand the relationship of the vocational counselor and employers to be described herein, it will first be necessary to define the setting in which the work takes place.

In June, 1964, the staff took possession and began readying the building to be known as Southmore House, division of Vocational Guidance Service of Houston, Texas. Southmore House was the result of more than two years of planning and search for funding for a halfway house to assist narcotic addicts in re-entering the community from institutions such as the National Institute of Mental Health Clinical Research Center, at Fort Worth, Texas. This planning had been initiated at the request from the staff at the hospital in Fort Worth to Mr. Frederick Wiener, Executive Director of Vocational Guidance Service.

> "Initially, the plan consisted of vocational counseling, job placement, and group therapy services. However, it soon became apparent that a more comprehensive program would need to be developed because of the erratic and complex problems characteristic of this group.
>
> As a result, the decision was to make the post hospital program more structured, and proposed to control most of the patient's environment by requiring his residence up to one year in a halfway house. Vocational, social casework, and recreational services were to be provided. The planned program envisioned mobilization of all available community, medical, social, and vocational services."[1]

The original full time staff consisted of a director, social worker, vocational counselor, house parents, secretary, and two cooks. Part-time personnel included a psychiatrist to consult with the staff and conduct group therapy, recreational leader, research consultants, and laboratory personnel to run the urinalyses used to determine drug abuse. With the exception of the house parents, and recreational workers, the composition of the original staff remained stable for the first two and one half years of operation. Although there have been major changes in structure and personnel recently, the house continues to function as originally planned. The operation is responsible to the Board of Directors of Vocational Guidance Service. The halfway house Board is responsible to the Board of Directors of Vocational Guidance Service. Aside from deciding policy and procedures, the Board is responsible for raising funds to match those received for operations from the Vocational Rehabilitation Agency, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

> "The characteristics of the group of offenders described herein is as follows. The data supplying this information was gathered in a 19 month period of operations. Of 86 persons admitted to Southmore House during this period, 49 were Anglo-American, 25 were Latin-American, and 12 were Negro. The age range was 17 through 59, with an average age of 33. Sixty-one residents were referred from the hospital in Fort Worth, 14 from the Texas Department of Corrections, and 11 from the community at large.
>
> An analysis of the arrests of this group reveals incarcerations in reform schools, hospitals, jails and prisons. The number of jail sentences ranged from zero to ten with an average of 2.4. Eighteen residents served 28 terms in reform schools with an average of 1.6 commitments. Sixty-nine residents had 129 hospitalizations for withdrawal from narcotics, with a range of one to seven, and an average of 1.9 hospitalizations. Thirty-five residents had not been in prison; however, 51 had served 111 prison terms."[2]

---

[1] Paul C. Baganz, M. A. "The Role of the Hospital in the Establishment of a Halfway House," **Rehabilitating the Narcotic Addict.** U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1966. p. 105.

One deviation from the original plan was that residents from areas of the country other than Houston were accepted almost from the onset of operations. Addicts from such locations as California, Illinois, Missouri, Puerto Rico, New Mexico, and others were accepted. Many were returned to their original homes; others stayed in the Houston area.

> "The socio-economic status of the residents during their childhood and youth varied. The division of classes into three classifications, and the subdivision of the classification into three categories, is based on Max Weber's operational definition of the variables which determine social class. None of the 49 Anglo-Americans were from the lower-lower class of economically deprived families. Three of the Latin-Americans and 80 percent of the Negro families were in the lower classification. 39 percent of the Latin-Americans, and 60 percent of the Negroes were reared in "broken" homes."[3]

The very nature of the project is indicative of the fact that the residents have not recently been *gainfully employed.* They have been engaged in institutional work, but here the incentive for production is more likely to be avoidance *of negative reinforcement* of money or goods. Prior to institutionalization, most addicts seen at Southmore House not only admitted that they had not been legitimately employed, but bragged about the illegitimate means by which they had supported their habits prior to "getting busted." Actually of the 86 males mentioned above, 65 were classified as unskilled, 14 were semi-skilled, and 7 were skilled workers in a trade or profession.

Educationally, the average resident completed the 10th grade, but tested out on a higher level. Staff estimates are that from 65 to 75 percent of the residents and non-resident clients seen at the House would be capable of performing academic work on the college or skilled technical level if they had the corresponding level of maturity necessary for such endeavors.

A brief look at the Houston labor market from 1964 to the present is as follows. This area is represented by a wide variety

---

[2] **Progress Report,** VRA Grant, No. RD-1280-P-68-C3, (Unpublished). pp. 2-3.

[3] Same as above, p. 3.

of diversified businesses and manufacturing which results in a balanced economy. The Port of Houston, NASA, and service industries all contribute greatly to the fast growing economy. In June of 1964, 31,850 were unemployed which constituted 4.7 percent of the total labor force. The figures did not change appreciably throughout the summer.

The average starting wage for unskilled workers is generally lower than in other parts of the country, and in many instances, is based on the federal minimum wage laws. Unions are not yet generally strong in the Houston area. The picture is a little different with the more technical or skilled types of employment with salaries more akin to those in other areas of the nation.

The actual methods used in contacting employers did not vary from normal placement procedures. Companies were initially contacted by telephone, and a general description of the objectives and function of Southmore House explained. If they responded favorably to the general idea of employing someone with a record of this nature, an appointment was arranged to solidify the contract. After the project was well under way, few companies were called without someone in particular in mind to place.

> "Almost all initial employer contacts generated the same types of questions. 'Can the addict be bonded? How will he affect my other employees? Can he affect them? Can addiction really be cured? Will the addict be dangerous to have around? What kinds of crimes might he commit?' "[4]

These and many more questions indicated that this was a problem more of an emotional nature than a rational one and that the solution was in the making rather that in research or scientific evaluation. For who had established precedent? Questions that we, the staff, asked ourselves included, "Where does the layman get his information about the addict? How is he portrayed in public media? How can we approach employers to hire residents? What shall our follow-up methods be?"

---

[4] Wiener, Frederick, and Turkington, Keith, "Job Placement of Addicts Through a Halfway House", **Rehabilitation Record**, Jan. and Feb., 1967, pp. 12 - 15.

With these questions in mind, a philosophy began to evolve which led to successful development of employer relations and consequently, placement of addicts on jobs.

Three steps were required. The first, as described above, involved the presentation of the functions of Southmore House to the employer. Included, were the duties of staff members, how potential residents were screened, and the restrictions and freedoms of the residents. Especially stressed was the control aspect of the program, that is urinalysis for detection of drug abuse.

With regard to the second step, we described the individual resident's background, stressing intellectual abilities, work skill, if any, educational, and other pertinent information which the employer would need to know. Interestingly, the Point Incentive Program, employed in the Texas Department of Corrections, proved to act as an employer reference, when it was explained to employers.

Finally, we worked out placement follow-up procedures with the employer. These included the communications necessary to follow the progress of the resident on the job, and relay information to the employer of the person's adjustment off the job. If a person reverted to the use of narcotics as evidenced by positive urinalyses, the employer was notified immediately. Many times we were able to predict trouble based on employer reports even before we received notification of a positive urine test from the laboratory.

Eventually, we found that the most successful approach was to let the employer set his own guidelines in working with us, rather than try to impose a plan on him. We would then keep in as close contact with him as he wanted.

In all cases, the resident or client was appraised of the procedures, and accepted employment knowing full well the consequences with his employer should he revert to drug abuse. Incidentally, there are a few cases on record when a resident did become readdicted, and retained his job, even after the employer had been notified. This did not help the project much, as inevitably, the situation got out of hand as the addiction progressed, with the employer usually suffering a resulting loss. Fortunately, this was not a frequent occurrance.

Let us now take a look at the results of employer contact during the initial 15 months of operation. In this time, contact was recorded with 121 businesses, labor organizations, agencies, and schools. These contacts involved telephone conversations and interviews with some responsible person or persons with the authority to hire. Detailed information was given as described earlier, and the results noted. The following information gives the classification of companies and the results of the contacts.

Type Organization	No. Contacted	Results
1. Industry-Manufacturer	31	11 Accepted
		8 Hired
		8 Rejected
		4 Undecided
2. Wholesalers, Retailers, & Distributors	33	9 Accepted
		12 Hired
		11 Rejected
		1 Undecided
3. Industrial & Retail Service (Including Trucking)	16	7 Accepted
		5 Hired
		4 Refused
4. Food, Restaurant, Hotels and Buildings	22	4 Accepted
		13 Hired
		5 Rejected
5. Construction & Related	8	2 Accepted
		5 Hired
		1 Rejected
6. City, County, State Agencies Institutions and Labor Organizations	10	6 Accepted
		4 Rejected

Three labor organizations were instrumental in placing residents on four jobs. (Included in the above figures).

To analyze the factors leading to the above figures would require ability more sophisticated than mine. Such characteristics as labor market conditions, availability of manpower, personalities and others would certainly have to be taken into account. Types sizes, and structure of companies are all important in understanding personnel practices and policies.

Understandably, the companies that require large numbers of unskilled workers and have high percentage of turn-over were the most readily amenable. It is probable, in such cases, that security measures are minimal, and that they employ indiscriminately. Other companies which readily accepted the idea, have enjoyed previous success in hiring offenders, and were receptive to any added cooperation they could enlist in working with this type of employee. There are companies who have personnel with true humanistic values who want to cooperate, knowing full well that experiments such as this may backfire; but they are willing to take the chance anyway. Such was the case with more than one person in an executive position who took it upon himself to hire Southmore House residents without first clearing it with higher powers. In one instance, this had almost disastrous results, even though we had cautioned the personnel man at the risk of not making the job placement.

Of course, there were employers who simply wanted to exploit labor of any kind. It is usually not hard to single out this type of employer, for the simple reason that he is the first to say, "I gave him a job, why should he expect to get paid for it too?" This may be exaggerated somewhat, but not much. Reasons given by companies that refused are as follows: previous unpleasant experience with this type personnel, too great a risk, union problems might be created, and others.

The placement figures reflect the positive response indicated in the above statistics. From August 1, 1964, through September 1, 1965, 31 residents were placed on 71 jobs, or 2.3 jobs per person. From September 1, 1965, through February 1, 1967, 48 out of 55 residents were placed on 89 jobs, or 1.8 jobs per person. The average starting wage for the 1965 - 1967 group was approximately $1.51 per hour. The salary range was from 97¢ per hour to $3.33 per hour.

All the types of jobs represented are too numerous to mention, but included were welder's helper, bus boy, stationary engineer, bartender, cook, draftsman trainee, television repairman, and helpers of all kinds.

In summing up our experiences pertaining to contacting employers for placement of offenders, the following points can be seen. Most important, for our purposes, is having the employer understand that although this is a rehabilitation program, the individuals we represent have abilities that can be assets. We emphasize that most Southmore House residents did not previously resort to crime unless they had habits to support; and that we are geared to detect drug abuse almost from the onset.

There are many factors which influence the success or failure of the individual in the total rehabilitation program. There is no question that employment plays a key role. The most important single factor, that we have found in developing our successful employment program for the offender, is the relationship developed between the staff and the employer. This relationship can only be established by an honest representation of the client and the program, developing with the employer an on-going plan for the client, and **consistently** following through on that plan.

REFERENCES

Bagnz, Paul C. M.A. "The Role of the Hospital in the Establishment of a Halfway House," **Rehabilitating the Narcotic Addict.** U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966, p. 105.

Progress Report, VRA Grant, No. RD-1280-P-68-C3, (Unpublished). pp. 2 - 3.

Wiener, Frederick, and Turkington, Keith, "Job Placement of Addicts through a Halfway House," **Rehabilitation Record.** Jan. and February, 1967, pp. 12 - 15.

GROUP DISCUSSION:
PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS IN OUR PROGRAMS

LEO JENKINS, MODERATOR

PRE RELEASE CENTER
CANON CITY, COLORADO

PANEL: DAVID D. BACHMAN

Deputy Director for Inmate Treatment
Florida Division of Corrections
Tallahassee, Florida

FIRST LIEUTENANT PHILLIP WELSH

Air Force Retraining Command
Lowry AFB, Colorado

EDWARD A. RUFUS

Director of Institution Parole Services
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

From left to right are Charles Craig, graduate student, Sam Houston State College; Jack Heard, Assistant Director, Texas Department of Corrections; and Capt. Phillip D. Welsh, Lowry AFB, Colorado.

CORRECTIONAL ASSUMPTIONS AND THEIR PROGRAM IMPLICATIONS

VINCENT O'LEARY

DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF
RESEARCH, INFORMATION, AND TRAINING
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

This session is directed toward an analysis of key correctional issues within the context of correctional history. It will be our purpose to briefly review that history and to suggest that various phases exemplify different assumptions about the nature of the correctional mission. These assumptions significantly shape correctional strategies, perceived manpower needs, and styles of behavior. They also shape various notions about appropriate prerelease programs.

Glaser has suggested that modern correctional history can be roughly divided into three areas. The first is the age of reform, which covered most of the 19th century. It reflected the belief of rationalists and bore a heavily religious stamp. Building on the work of Freud and others, the age of rehabilitation followed. This generally covered the first half of the twentieth century. Finally, Glaser identifies the age of reintegration, the presently merging mode, which makes society, as well as the individual, the focus of intervention. He emphasizes that each of the eras overlap the other and we find the influence of all today.

The relevance of this historical description to the contemporary scene is best seen when we focus on the behavior which each era tended to support. For it is these behaviors which continue to operate and powerfully influence corrections. A way of conceptualizing these behaviors is to specify some of the important assumptions underlying the eras sketched by Glaser. The work of Jay Hall is quite useful for this purpose. He has classified various belief systems about the way that change in human behavior is induced.

Three of these systems are relevant to the discussion. The first is labeled change via compliance. This system argues that people change only when what is required of them is clearly spelled out and consistent enforcement of those norms is insured. Further, when people are required to adopt new behaviors they will eventually learn congruent attitudes. These assumptions about change require power on the part of the changer and the ability to maintain constant surveillance.

A second category is client-centered change. Here the assumption is that persons are motivated by growth needs and will gravitate toward the social values of the "mature" person once they are free to do so. Authority is antithetical to such a free choice. Trust and appreciation are the keys to this strategy.

A third is change via credibility. The need for compliance and personal goal expression are integrated; change must "make sense" to the person who is the target of intervention. The task is to identify those behaviors which make for rewarding living, which means in the context of social rules. A change agent is an expert mediator between the person and his environment. Reality testing is a major theme with problems being attacked in the social setting where they reside.

The change systems of Hall's scheme aptly describe the dominant ideological underpinnings of three historical phases suggested by Glaser. Using these notions in combination — reform-compliance, rehabilitation-client centered, reintegration-credibility — we can construct a conceptual frame of reference, which lends itself to an examination of the type of contemporary correctional behavior which flows from each. The problem of any such typology is that it tends to exaggerate and suggest a consistency which is rarely found in real life. Despite this fault, it is a useful analytic tool.

We will look in turn at correctional models, staff ideals, parole board functions, due process concerns, and some of the pre-release concepts which are implicit in each of these historical, social-psychological combinations.

I. CORRECTIONAL MODELS

A. Reform—Compliance

The essential aim of this correctional model is to instill "good habits." Inmates are required to work diligently and in so doing they are expected to acquire behavior habits which will carry over outside of the institution once their sentence is completed.

Institutions are usually located far from a population center and depend on their own resources as much as possible. Activities, such as recreation or education, are secondary to the core program and are used primarily to relieve tedium or advance the work mission. Exhortation is the dominant form of persuasion attempted. Parole staff are most often located in buildings used by police departments, which is consistent with the notion of emphasis on surveillance.

B. Rehabilitation—Client Centered

The idea that the criminal is a sick person underlies this model. The ideal prison shifts from a place in which work habits are instilled to one which resembles a hospital. The language of the system diagnosis, prognosis — is borrowed from the medical profession The emphasis is on developing insight among inmates. Programs which allow inmates to express themselves are highly valued. Persuasion is used occasionally, but the main concerns expressed are understanding and support.

Prisons continue to be largely self-contained units, far from urban centers, where, ideally, skilled practitioners work with inmates. Parole offices tend to be located in private office buildings and take on many of the characteristics of private counseling agencies. Emphasis is placed on periodic interviews in the office with the parolee in an attempt to resolve his personal problems.

C. Reintegration—Credibility

This model makes collaboration between inmates, the community, and change agents the correctional ideal. There is great concern with reducing stigmatization to the minimum degree. Institutions are used as little as possible; community treatment is the preferred alternative. Those institutions which are built, are located close to the community with a heavy emphasis on the use of resources such as educational opportunities in the community.

Inmates are directly involved in shaping their program and share significant decision-making with staff. Persuasion is attempted infrequently; the sharing of information is the main emphasis. Parole officers are moved into the neighborhoods so they are better able to intervene in the community as well as the personal life of the parolee. There is deep involvement with community institutions such as schools, churches and employers.

II. STAFF IDEALS

A. Reform—Compliance

Firm but fair is the motto here. The stress is on practical skills such as farming and carpentry. By and large a high degree of education for employees is not highly emphasized.
Most important is a dedication to the ideals of a larger society. The solid yeoman in many respects, best describes the type of correctional worker sought.

The effective parole officer is the one who has the ability to closely relate to police agencies and check on parolees efficiently. He will brook little deviation from the rules of parole.

B. Rehabilitation—Client Centered

The therapist becomes the ideal figure among institutional staff. Custodial and treatment personnel are split, with the latter viewed as the professional who has the responsibility for changing the behavior of inmates. Custodial personnel are to maintain the setting in which treatment is carried out. Social work becomes the education of first choice for counselors.

The dominant ideology among parole officers is individual psychotherapy. The main skill sought is the ability to develop self-understanding and acceptance by parolees.

C. Reintegration—Credibility

The team is stressed here. The resources for inducing change represented by all staff are valued. Thus, emphasis is placed on using custodial staff, as well as others, in change efforts. A community of skills, including a variety of professional discipline, is the aim rather than an hierarchical system built on a specific professional system. The use of non-professionals and volunteers is encouraged.

Parole officers are required to intervene effectively in the community as well as work directly with parolees. The skills needed to modify social structures are given a high priority.

III. DUE PROCESS CONCERNS

A. Reform—Compliance

The argument from this frame of reference is that once convicted, an inmate loses all rights. Parole or any other lessening of penalty is a privilege granted by the state which can be withdrawn at any time at the state's discretion. Giving legal "rights" to inmates undermines the authority of staff and lessens their capacity to induce change. Using the rights granted them, inmates simply expand energy avoiding change rather than using that energy in learning new habits.

B. Rehabilitation—Client Centered

The state's role is a beneficent one. The introduction of procedures such as the right to notice, counsel and witnesses, injects an adversarial tension in what should be a harmonious relationships between staff and inmate. The disclosure of records threatens professional relationships and implies a distrust of staff who are genuinely interested in the welfare of their clients. Such procedures are seen as unnecessary legalisms which interfere with staff efforts to help inmates.

C. Reintegration — Credibility

Confrontation and openness are the "sine qua non" of the strategies implied here. The correctional system is as subject to test as is all other reality with which the inmate must deal. The sharing of power with inmates in decisions affecting their destiny is also a necessary step in successful change attempts. Thus, due process notions are not perceived as being necessarily incompatible with efforts to induce change.

IV. PAROLE BOARD FUNCTIONS

A. Reform—Compliance

Administering a program of clemency is the task of a parole board under this system. It metes out equitable punishment and extends appropriate forgiveness to inmates when they have done sufficient time to pay for their offense. Those who can closely represent the values and interests of the community are best suited to be board members.

Contrition on the part of the inmate and the promise of work by a reliable employer are major decision-making concerns at the time of parole. Revocation decisions are significantly based on whether the parolee has violated any of the detailed list of conditions which govern his behavior.

B. Rehabilitation—Client Centered

The ideal parole board in this system is modeled closely on that of a clinical review board in a hospital. Stress is placed on having professionals on the board who understand and can undertake therapeutic roles and procedures.

Case decisions are based primarily on the degree to which an inmate has developed insight into his problem and is "well enough" to return to the community. Revocation decisions often depend on such concerns as whether an inmate needs to return to an institution for further treatment. Rules tend to be de-emphasized.

C. Reintegration—Credibility

From this view, a parole board is seen as a group which primarily monitors decisions involving many other persons. It also acts as an appellate body from the decisions of others. The use of parole examiners is often encouraged. The board articulates its policies so that they are fully understood by as many as possible. Stress is placed on maintaining the parolee in the community. Revocation is used as a last resort. Rules are spelled out clearly, but are few in number and are developed as part of the treatment plan with the inmate.

V. PRE-RELEASE CONCEPTS

A. Reform—Compliance

Pre-release programs are minimal. They usually take the form of a reduction in custody to reward the inmate for his compliance. The belief under this system is that necessary change has already taken place and what is needed is simply reinforcement of the direction of that change in the community.

If any pre-release classes are conducted, they are primarily to instruct inmates how to behave most appropriately in the community. Parole staff are used to verify the existence of a satisfactory job and to convey community feelings to the paroling authority.

B. Rehabilitation—Client Centered

Concerns about pre-release activities are somewhat greater under this system, but are not central. The emphasis in pre-release programs is to reduce stress on the inmate and to continue to encourage his personal growth. Classes might be conducted in which inmates feelings about return home are explored.

Considerable effort is placed on developing a positive relationship with the parole officer who is to supervise the inmate. His pre-release efforts in the community are heavily flavored by concern about the incipient interpersonal relationship with the parolee. Major activity in the case begins when the parolee arrives in the office and a counseling relationship is undertaken.

C. Reintegration—Credibility

In this system, activities usually placed under the rubric of pre-release are among the most central concerns of corrections. The emphasis is to minimize as much as possible the break between the inmate and the community and to make the community the locus of treatment. The institution in which the inmate is confined is in the same community to which he will be released.

Opportunity for new learning in the community is sought out and used. There is a great use of community resources, such as academic and vocational training programs. Testing reality requires that inmates be given increasing opportunties to confront community life. Counseling efforts are focused on the confrontation and its attendant problems.

The parole officer is directly involved with the inmate and with significant persons and community forces in his life while he is incarcerated. He is concerned with making needed changes in the social structure which will create opportunities for the inmate, such as legitimate career employment. The parole officer acts as an advocate as well as a counselor and mediator.

CONCLUSION

We have attempted to trace out the behaviors which are implicit in three different notions about how change may be induced. For example, some persons act from a rehabilitation-client centered frame of reference when concerned with staff issues and from a reintegration-credibility stance on issues of due process. Many people seem to lack any theory at all. This lack inevitably means that their behavior invites consequences quite different than those they seek. A clear understanding of the assumptions implicit in various behavior which is aimed at inducing change in others is valuable in guiding and developing more effective methods.

No claim has been made in this session as to the change strategy which seems most likely to be successful. The reports of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice generally advocates a reintegration-credibility stance. The best evidence currently available, and it is very sketchy, indicates that it is the most likely strategy to succeed with the largest number of inmates. Other tactics may be more appropriate with some others. Only continuous testing of correctional programs will yield more precise evidence about these issues.

THE CHANGING PROGRAM OF PRE-RELEASE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

GERALD A. COLLINS

COORDINATOR OF COMMUNITY CENTERS PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF PRISONS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Let me give to you, the original assumption or assumptions and the original purpose of the pre-release guidance centers which were opened in 1961, during September and October in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York. Los Angeles and Chicago were where the Bureau of Prisons operated pre-release centers while the center in New York City was operated on a contract basis by Springfield, Massachusetts College. We executed a contract with them to provide basic services similar to those that we wanted from our own pre-release guidance centers in Los Angeles and Chicago. The basic assumption was — that the six months immediately following release from an institution was most critical— in terms of, parole success or failure. Pre-release guidance centers should be designed to provide for the orderly reintroduction of youth and juvenile offenders to the community in the sixty to ninety days immediately preceding their release on parole. This is very specific, in terms of limits, sixty to ninety days, for juveniles and youth offenders which for the Federal Bureau of Prisons means population. They range in age from 18 to 25, and have been committed under two definite Federal statutes, the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act and the Youth Correction Act. The Youth Correction Act is an indeterminate sentence, six years in length, parole possible at any time after the first day, parole mandatory no later than four years from the date of commitment, and with no good time credits of any kind during the length of sentence. The sentence runs uninterrupted from the day it is started until the day it is finished, with the provision that if the commitment is terminated earlier than six years from the date of imposition by action of the parole board, the conviction, sentence, and commitment are wiped out. There is no remaining record available; so there is supposed to be a great deal of motivation for the individual to do well.

The orderly reintroduction sounds nice, the question is how does one go about an orderly reintroduction of an individual to the community. This was the mission of the twenty-odd people involved in the Federal Pre-Release Center Program from its inception. The fact that we got anywhere at all is surprising. We started out, and most of us were institutional men with an occasional maverick probation officer, whom we soon converted. We started off with the assumption that through a carefully structured counseling and guidance program we were going to perform some sort of magic with the individuals transferred to us which would make it possible for them to go out on parole and do well, thus become successes. This carefully structured counseling and guidance program turned out eventually to be nothing except words. We were never able to get a carefully structured counseling and guidance program under way in these Center Programs. What we did do, we found, was to begin to create a small institution located in the community, developing along very similar lines to the larger institutions isolated from the community. Let me explain that, we started on the basic assumption that the individual came to us from nowhere, that there had been no change, that this was still an untreated, unrehabilitated, unreformed individual. He had come from nowhere, nothing had been done, and we had the whole job to do so we started with step one. First of all, we had to get to know him, to evaluate him, and to diagnose him. We had to establish a relationship with him that would allow him to ease into a productive therapeutic relationship. When we got all of this done; then we would do some testing. We would open the door of these community based pre-release guidance centers; and we let him out a little and as soon as he started to shake, the rubber band snapped; and we would yank him back into the program, and close the doors and go back to the treatment process. This is fine for about ninety days and then we found out that here we were running up against a fact of life. This man has a parole grant from the United States Board of Parole which says, "Today is the day he leaves. Today is the day he goes on parole supervision." We have evaluated, counseled and guided, in a little institution and the only thing that was in this man's mind was, "Now they are going to let me out of the joint where I'm going to get to the streets again." So we said, "What we've got to do is to ask the Board to give us a little more time. We will get the probation officer over here; he will talk to the guy; and he will establish a relationship with him. He can work with him, diagnose, counsel, guide, and evaluate him. This worked fine. The probation officer came and established the relationship. He diagnosed, counseled, and evaluated. Then the fellow went out on the streets. In the meantime we did some things like, we helped him find a job that we picked out for him, that we hand-carried him to. We said to the employer, 'Please do not be mean to this fellow. He has a record; but he is a good guy and he knows good guys. We have come this far in our evaluation. If you look out for him and be good to him, he might turn out to be a productive worker for you some day.' "

We didn't stay with this orderly reintroduction business more than the first three or four months until we began to get our feet wet. We found first a terrible mistake in our assumption process. We assumed in all this that the individual had to demonstrate to us, as institutional guards, that he was a good boy and that he really deserved the privilege. We determined that this individual — whether he was ready, willing, able, or good, having earned the privilege or not — needed to get his feet wet outside. Our purpose was not to say, "Okay, you've been good; you can go outside the institution for an hour." The moment the man got to the center our purpose was to start moving him into the areas of stress, frustration, competition, productivity, whether he wanted to go or not. These were the things he had to do in a reality situation. He had to find out whether the vocational training that he had learned in the institution was going to stand up under the scrutiny of the employer in the community. He was going to have to learn whether or not he could pass the apprenticeship examination, for whatever field he wanted to enter, based on his preliminary education in the institution. He didn't have to prove to us that he was good so that we would let him go out, take the test, try this experience on for size, or spend the week-end with his wife and kids, or his family. He needed that. It was necessary that we do this beginning the day he got to the Center, and increasingly, just as rapidly as he can handle responsibility. Just as rapidly as he can move from one step to the next, we needed to move him into every conceivable functioning situation in the community that we could. This is lesson number one that we learned.

The second lesson that we learned was that we couldn't do the job alone and this was not an internal program. Fortunately we didn't fall into the trap of saying, "These are our problems, in terms of staff, time, and money resources. We need more staff, time and money." This would have been easy to do. We found by accident, I think that in the community there were already functioning agencies, programs, and services, that could do many of the things that this individual needed to have done.

They could do them not for sixty, ninety, or one hundred and twenty days, as in our program, but they could do them as long as the individual needed these services performed and as long as he needed to be involved with the services. The question then was how do we get them. Somebody mentioned bringing into the center outside resources, such as: AA Groups, vocational rehabilitation, family service agencies, and mental health programs. I think this is a step backward. I think that there is no point in using the center as a focus for these services. I think the individual has to use these services where they are. He has to know how to get to them, when the center is no longer helping or controlling him. He has to know where to go to get what he needs. He has to know where to go to find a job, not just any job, but a job that is consistent with his skills. He needs a job that meets his economic needs, his ambitions, and his preferences. If we bring an employment service into the Center program, this serves him for 90 days, but suppose he loses the job. You want him to come back to the Center? Do you see what would happen if you go on this way? You have to fall back on the old cry, "We don't have any more resources to do these things. Give us more staff and more resources because we have all these extra needs that we didn't anticipate." We need to focus our attempts outward and attach the man to service, agencies, resources, existing in the community which he can use today, tomorrow, and the day after.

I pointed out to you, an operational change and orientation change which was a critical one. We moved our focus from inward, doing what needs to be done today, to focusing out, since this is really the place where the process begins. The staff becomes resource brokers. They know where an individual can get, can find, and can go for the things he needs. They don't provide them in themselves, but they can say, "In dealing with an individual on a one to one basis or a team basis, this is what you feel you need and we feel you need. These are the things that need to be done. These are the alternatives you have. These are the places you can go. These are the behaviors you can exhibit, if this is the way you want it. You can go there. We have an individual you can contact. This is the name. This is the place. This is the resource. We spell out what is there, how he gets to it, and how he uses it. This is our function in the Center program.

Now you get to some specifics about change from pre-release guidance center, which by the way is non-existent as far as the

Bureau of Prisons is concerned. We have no more pre-release guidance centers. We have for want of a better word Community Treatment Centers. It is not just a change in name, but a change in orientation. We no longer specify that these programs will serve juvenile offenders between 18 and 25. The specifications are as follows:

a. Types of offenders. This is under the heading of case selection. While the majority of offenders accepted in these programs will be in the 20 to 35 age range offenders above or below these ages may be referred, however, we do point out that for men over 35 and under 20 all alternative release plans should be explored before the decision is made to refer to the center.

b. Types of release. This refers in the federal system to maximum expiration of sentence, mandatory release, (conditional release) or parole.

We also have another case selection tool called "identification of needs". This is the big step; this is a new one. Why is this man being sent to the center? What do you expect, what do you want? This is pointed toward the institution people. What is your rationale for sending this man to the center? What are the things he needs? What has been done? What skills does he have? What level are these skills? What is his capacity? Tell what needs to be done in the short period that we have. This implies also that the institution people must know what the centers can do, what the resources are, and what the effect of the center is; otherwise, they cannot tell us anything about the needs of the individual.

If for instance they say that this man is psychotic, that he is completely irrational, and out of touch with reality, and disfunctional, then his needs are established. However, they are not related to the center's ability to perform. The center performs in certain specified ways. It provides assistance for a man who has demonstrated that he can achieve, and that he has achieved some things. What he needs now is to apply what he has learned, and what skills he has developed, in terms of, the problems he had in the community that were responsible for his getting into difficulty. It is the responsibilty of the institutional staff to tell us in quantifiable terms what we need to do. When the man comes to the center we already know enough about him to have a general plan developed. We may have to modify this as soon as he gets there, because as you well know traditional institutions do not provide the best testing ground for various levels of achievement. There may be home distortion in this and we may have to modify these goals to some extent. Basically we can operate from this need plan that is set up. We then start building with the offender the kind of center program which gets him where he wants to go as quickly as possible, and as effectively as possible. We bring in every single resource that we can. We familiarize him with it and say, "This is what you need. We will monitor. We will support. We will encourage. However from now on these are the ways that you said you wanted to go, so now get busy at it." If the man falters, or falls on his face, or gets into difficulty, the first reaction is not to say lock him up and send him back. Those we lock up and send back should also be planned for. What are the reasons for a man going back? One reason is that something still needs to be done. Something is missing; something is inadequate. He perhaps didn't get enough vocational training. We have two alternatives at this point. We can send him back to the institution for a specified training program or we can try to arrange some sort of supplemental training program in the community. Sometimes the man demonstrates that he can't handle the responsibility that he has. He may have a wife, and a couple of kids that have been subsisting on an ADC grant during the time he was gone. The financial problem is so great that the only thing he wants to do is to get out of there. He can't face it. Suppose the center program can't counsel with the man, and suppose that this man's reaction to stress is to get into somebody else's car and head for California. We must be alert enough to note that. He must be reprogrammed in such a way that the problem does not cause him to again escape from the difficult situation. We have a couple of alternatives. We can increase his earning power by finding him a better job at a higher rate of pay; or we can send him back to an institution and let him work out of a work release program. There he can tear down these tremendous financial problems through the aid of the work release program.

Another development is the service to the courts, or the observation and evaluation of the non-institution committed offender. We brought him directly from the court to the center. Initially, we started off with an observation and an evaluation. We very carefully observed his reactions to the program. We also got the medical, psychiatric, educational, vocational, and factual testing programs out of the way through contract resources, except where a federal institution was available we had most of the costly work done there. We found that the courts liked the type of evaluation which says, "Although this man has work skills which are adequate, his behavior toward authority figures is such that he cannot hold a job. This is an individual that cannot operate in a structured situation. This is an individual who can do this or an individual who has difficulty here." We were able to specify this in terms of the areas that he would have to handle if he were placed on probation and in terms of the areas that he would have to handle if he were placed in an institution. So our recommendation to the courts took on an aura of reality. We were able to speak in community terms that the court could understand rather than our previous artificial institution evaluation.

At this point we are operating community treatment centers which are in Kansas City, Houston, Atlanta, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Oakland. Four of these centers have facilities to work with women, the others are thinking about developing services for women. None of these centers is talking about confining an individual, or talking about custody of, or talking about control or surveillance of. These centers are talking about involving the individual in the things that he is going to have to do under parole supervision, under managerial supervision, or under no supervision if he is a flat timer. They are talking in terms of helping him learn how to test himself against the responsibilities and the problems he has, and giving him assistance where he shows weakness. The assistance does not necessarily come from the center itself but from whatever agency or resource we can get. We plan for it for as long as it may take, not just for the short period of time the individual is in the specific center program.

Recently we are beginning to get through to the United States Parole Board that we can provide for them the same kind of information that we can give to the courts on evaluations. We can tell the parole board, "Here is some real hard information on which you can make parole decisions. Here is data which says, 'This individual can function here, here, here, and cannot function here.' Do you want to grant parole on this basis? The chances are about 60-40 that he can make parole. He is going to have to have considerable help from the probation officer in these two areas; but he shouldn't need any help or attention from the probation officer over here." Now we can spell this out in quantitative terms. The probation officer can look at this and say, "I don't have to deal with a vague, ambiguous situation, I know specifically where I can direct my efforts with this individual. If I can believe what these fellows over here say." If he will get involved with us so that he can see that we really can give him information, and not only this, but we can ask information from him, then we can work with him as a cooperative agency, as a member of the team. A team is designed to get the individual, Joe Smith, from here, which is conviction, to over here, as quickly and as effectively as possible, to a point where he is now not only non-criminal but reasonably productive in the community; and if we want to reach real far, we can say non-criminal, reasonably productive, reasonably satisfied with himself and his family, and his future.

Anyone who has any questions, any challenges, any commentary, feel free to speak and I will try to respond.

QUESTION: What does your program actually consist of? Could you tell me what your typical man would receive from your program? ANSWER: No, I don't think I could. I don't think you would find that there would be any typical procedure through the program. We can't build this kind of structure into it. We don't have anything but an individual needing evaluation. Let me see if I can answer you a little more specifically. You say, "Do we send a man out into the community to look for a job?" We might if the employment placement specialist felt this man could go out and look effectively. There would be no point in not taking him by the hand, would there? If he knew how to look for a job, knew what kind of job he wanted, knew how much money he needed to exist, and had planned this out, then it would be perfectly logical to say, "Alright here is a telephone book, the yellow pages, the newspaper, the address of the employment service, and the addresses of several employers who have the kind of jobs that you might be interested in, go look." This might be perfectly consistent with the program for one individual; but suppose you don't have an individual who is able to do this. It might be necessary with that individual to spend several days in the center, talking to him, helping him to find out what it is that he is interested in, helping him decide how much money it's going to take for him to support his family, how much money he is going to need right now, and how he can translate this into a job. He might want to be a dishwasher, for instance. He might say, "I want to start as a dishwasher and then I can become a head cook and make $700.00 a month five years from now." The dishwashers today get paid $1.25 per hour, if that, or maybe a dollar and a half. This man has a wife and three kids. Would it be realistic for us to send this man off with an okay, you want to be a dishwasher, these are your long range plans, here are the addresses of several people who will hire dishwashers. This wouldn't be consistent with our program. We would have to help this man determine as completely as possible, what he would need to do in order to function outside. Then we would have to help him get started in the direction he needs to go. It is possible that we could study the alternatives with him. What I am driving at, is that we aren't doing this for him. This is an educational process, a process whereby this man learns acceptable alternative behaviors, that he was not aware of, and not able to use in these stress situations previously. For instance, if an individual needs legal aid we can say, "Here are the names of a half dozen attorneys who are interested in helping people like you. Would you like to make an appointment or would you like for me to make you an appointment."

QUESTION: What do you think about telling the person of all the resources available to him through agencies upon his release? ANSWER: I think I would have to quibble with you on that because knowing offenders, or at least hoping that I know offenders. They are going to go back to where they got the original information. If you let them back into your pre-release unit to get started into these things when they need them, then fine. After he has been through the program, I feel that the man is not supposed to come back here to get attached to another resource to begin or to find out where he needs to get another resource. He has got to get out and start dealing with these things where they exist in the community. He's got to know where that attorney's office is, and what it is like to go in there. He has to know what it is like to approach the attorney. Once he has done this, it is possible for him to go back much easier. If the attorney comes from Houston to Huntsville and says, "My address is blank, write it down." If you need help, that's a far cry from his getting there to get that help. The point I am trying to get across is that to make this as natural as possible, you fit this man in like everybody else. The regular man on the street doesn't go to a parole officer to find out about an attorney. He doesn't come into the community treatment center to find out how to get vocational rehabilitation. Does he? If we are going to approximate, if we are going to naturalize these processes, they have to be as close to the normal functioning of the community as possible, otherwise I think we stand a great chance of getting lost.

QUESTION: What do you do when the man is discharged and you can't send him back to the institution for additional trade training. ANSWER: We do as much of the job as we can, except that our alternatives get slightly compressed at that point. We don't have the power of tying a man into an institutional program. We do have the other alternative still available to us. If the man, has a physical problem or a combination of an emotional and physical problem, we can't send him back to the institution for more work on this. We can involve him with community agencies that will provide ongoing services, such as vocational rehabilitation and manpower training and development. Many programs do exist in the community for the individual if we can motivate him to continue this on his own. Let me get specific. If an individual is employed, and needs a skill upgraded, but he is an expiration case, we can't do anything about this. We might try to involve this man with a couple of his co-workers who would be interested enough in him to encourage him, as many of our friends and co-workers do, to better himself and to build up his deficiencies in this area. There are alternatives if we don't get ourselves constricted in looking for them. If we keep digging in the community, there are many resources that we can use to involve this man.

QUESTION: Do you have any preliminary work done with these men in the institution before they come to your agency? ANSWER: I would hope the first day of a man's sentence or the day he walks into the institution and needs classification, they establish his needs and goals. If one of the goals is eventual participation in one of these programs, then they should be plannig and developing all the way to their departure from the institution and their transfer to the center. I can't tell you that this is being done in every case, I don't intend to do that; but this is our goal, and this is the direction in which we are working. This is the consistent program of progress, not just institution and center, but institution, center and eventual parole.

A WARDEN LOOKS AT PRE-RELEASE

J. E. BAKER

WARDEN OF PENITENTIARY OF NEW MEXICO
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

I want to talk with you about people and pre-release, and about preparing both the staff and inmate body to participate in a pre release operation. Pre-release programming is a part of the overall institutional, correctional effort. It can't be isolated from other activities although we may speak of it as a chunk of treatment that we are going to do here at the end of the term or near the end of the term. Ideally the thrust of institutional programming should be in the direction of release planning commencing with admission classification. That's nothing new, it has been said before. Pre Release programming began in the early 1940's when correctional administration finally woke up, and realized that something definite should be done to help inmates bridge the gap between the prison community and life in a free society. So the concept that we know now as pre release was born and was added to the machinery and tools of corrections.

Any program of correctional treatment is accomplished through people and only through people. Pre Release is no exception. So, basic to any effective program of pre release are these two things: first, you must have a general program and you must have an institutional atmosphere which motivates and encourages people toward self-improvement. When I refer to people, I speak of both staff and inmates. Second, you must prepare those people for the program. The old saying, "Release problems start on the day of admission or should," is no longer a cliche. It is an accepted fact, or it had better be, if the instutition is to obtain any measure of success in accomplishing its most noble purpose, the restoration of the offender to a useful and productive life in society. This accepted fact mandates that the total energy of the staff be utilized in community oriented programs. It is not our purpose this afternoon to outline or to explore the content of these programs, but it is cogent to our discussion to comment on the techniques and experiences by which the staff can be encouraged to adopt such a frame of reference toward community oriented programs.

We can look back at the classification process and reception program and ask ourselves some of these questions. What do we do to provide personal contact between the general staff and the new client; or do we hide the new inmate away only for the treatment people? Do we have regularly conducted tours of institutional facilities? Do we have interpretations of their functions by the various members of the staff; and I'm talking about the total staff not just the treatment staff. Let's examine the diagnostic period, whatever that really means in your particular institution. What encouragement is there to use records hidden away for the use of a specialized group? What observations regarding inmate progress are contributed by the general staff? Do you rely only on the small statement of your treatment compliment to furnish these reports to you. What if any use is made of pre-classification assignments where the general staff may have an opportunity to incorporate observations into the diagnostic process. In the matter of program planning, do we make an effective use of new approaches such as the team treatment approach? If we don't believe in this approach or if we don't utilize the team treatment concept, do we have any alternate plan such as periodic or temporary assignments to the classification committee for the staff members who ordinarily wouldn't be associated with that activity. All this of course is for the purpose of acquainting staff and client one with the other.

The next area which we can consider is the staff training program. How much emphasis do we put on teaching the dynamics of human behavior to our general staff? How much does our general staff know about the causes of delinquency, the concept of role models of staff, and effecting changes in values. The greatest thing we have going for us in corrections is ourselves, our own personal model that we give and demonstrate to an offender everyday. How much do we emphasize this to our general staff? How important is it? Do we make interpretations of research, which have been conducted on who succeeds after correctional treatment and why do they fail? Do we do it in an attempt to train our staff in any way? Another area is that of parole laws and rules. In my own institution, and at others I have asked the general staff, "What do you know about parole laws and rules, release laws, and rules of your particular state?" It is amazing to me that the mass of ignorance is so staggering. Do we make a real attempt to acquaint the staff with the statutory basis for parole release, or the requirements for parole, or the implications of the parole rules, or the necessity of post-release counseling and guidance? Do any of the uniform people ever know about this?

Last on my list but by no means exhaustive of all considerations that might be given is the topic of community programs, which is our specific focus here at this seminar. Under community programs we include work release, guidance centers, community treatment centers and halfway houses whether they are in or out. How much of the experience of each of these new correctional tools is communicated to the staff? How much do we really tell our staff about the experience? How much feedback has there been about how we use these particular correctional tools? Here again the mass of ignorance is high and quite staggering. If we can teach people about the experience that has been accumulated to date, and we have an adequate feedback, I think we would make more effective and efficient involvement in the pre-release operation.

For the pre release operation, just as for any endeavor, we are going to select the best man or woman for the job. Those staff members who by inclination and demonstration are obviously the most capable are the ones we must select to carry out this last phase of the correctional effort. The position an employee occupies does not necessarily make him the best qualified for a program such as pre release. Traditionally classification and parole personnel had been the group assigned the responsibility of the pre release operation. These persons might be highly qualified in their speciality, yet they had no strong motivation or special expertise in group dynamics, which all of us know is an essential element in pre release programs. On the other hand, the Captain, Lieutenant, Carpenter, or some service employee might have education, and enthusiasm, thus being highly motivated, and consequently better qualified for the assignment. It doesn't have to be an exclusive thing. Don't short change yourself, nor your client by limiting yourself to classification people or the treatment personnel. You are losing a lot of treatment value if you don't go to your uniformed people or the staff in general. One of the most successful persons in a pre release program that I ever had the opportunity to know was not a member of any of the helping disciplines, rather he was the institutional industries safety man. His role in the program was to discuss highways, industrial, and home safety practices. This was a part of our beginning pre release efforts. Actually he did much more, he conducted group therapy and industrial mental hygiene. This man became a group therapist and certainly added a great deal to the pre release operation. His explorations on how to perform safely on the job were by their very nature discussions on peer and supervisory relationships. We would certainly have shortchanged ourselves if we hadn't involved this particular man in the program; yet traditionally this is not the type of person that you

64

would select to participate in the program. Conversely, the case worker we had at the time who was considered highly competent in one to one relationships, was a conspicuous flop in dealing with the group. His experiences in the pre release program were filled with traumas for both himself and the unfortunate inmates for whom he was leading the discussion. The selection of the staff, shouldn't be made on the basis of position or department; don't limit yourself. While a particular department might be assigned a supervisory responsibility for the pre release operation and choice of particpants must be staff wide, so that you and particularly the client will have benefit of the most enthusiatic, the best motivated and consequently the highest qualified staff effort.

There is a word of caution that I would like to give you in preparing staffs for the pre release operation, and that is, don't permit the staff to be carried away by the wish to provide extras in the program, such as goodies—coffee, cake, soft chairs, and special lighting. Basically, I regard these things as means of seducing inmates to participate. Many staff members fear an empty room or having to call a meeting and then no one will show up. They will have this fear if it is on a voluntary basis. I think for a program to be really an effective program most of it must be on a voluntary basis. The best insurance against this rather grim spector is a sound program, which will stand on its own merits without such crutches as cookies, soft lights, and soft chairs. In this connection, the research we did ourselves showed that inmates remembered least after six months to a year the increased privileges. Inmates though such things as increased correspondence and visiting privileges as not an important part of the program.

I think that we should take a long hard look at our methods, that is, the way we are running our institutions. If we still have restrictions on the number of letters a person may send or receive at any time, I think it is questionable. In our own institution and in the last several that I have had the opportunity to serve in, this was not a part of the program. We would never think of restricting the correspondence or the visiting of the person at any time during his term. So that when the pre release period came this could not be an extra privilege; and I think if you have this in your institution you should seriously examine why you are doing it. I think that restrictions such as this have no place in a modern helping service, or in modern corrections. I believe this way because they tend to defeat the very things that we say we want to accomplish. We say that we want continued identification of the offender with the com-

65

munity; and we want to foster ties with meaningful relatives and friends. Actually we do just the opposite when we make these restrictions. These two privileges provide an opportunity for us to make a very practical beginning of pre-release on the day the man arrives at the institution, if we don't impose any restrictions as to the number of letters to be sent or received.

The focus of pre release, as it was orginally conceived many years ago, was solely on assisting the man or woman to meet the shock of release into the community. In the 1940's who would ever have foreseen the tremendous development that has taken place in the last two decades in halfway houses and work release programs. We mentioned at noon about some of our employee attitudes. There was a cartoon that appeared in a Bureau of Prisons Personnel Publication not long ago. It had to do with work release. On the wall was a little sign that said "Old Guard Home" and on the floor there was a fellow lying with a long white beard and a prison uniform. There were two others standing there leaning on their canes and one said to the other, "You shouldn't have told him about work release."

Even though these ideas have developed only recently, they've been around a long time. Someone has listed the chronological history of half way houses. In some other work that I was doing, I came across a reference of 1826 in an Eastern state. The prison administrator at that time, mentioned to the legislature the desirability of having a house on the prison grounds to which men could be assigned while working in the community or while looking for jobs. Nothing was really done about that. Just as an aside, while I did find one further reference to the idea, I never found any further reference to that poor administrator after he had made such an audacious proposal. I don't know whatever happened to him. Maybe he never knew what hit him.

Today institutional pre release programs need to be developed with a broader scope and more diverse goals. For instance, when it is believed that a man might soon be ready for work release, he can profit by participating in a sound pre-release program. This would be the time to commence pre-release in the institution. On work release, this man faces daily many of the problems of a parolee or a dischargee; in fact, certain problems are compounded by reason of his work release status. I think he can gain much by discussions centered on job relationships and management of money. The alcoholic and the narcotic user are two examples of correctional institution majority groups who need special counseling in their particular problem areas. They would profit by participating in a good pre-release program prior to being considered for work release, halfway houses, etc. Further there is the question of the man or woman's relationships with others, and his social life. How shall the work releasee cope with the many situations which will arise and that will hit him in the face whenever he goes out into the community? For instance, the gang at work wants him to go bowling, or have a beer after the day's work, or a member of the opposite sex might take an interest in him and drop obvious hints of her availability. How is he going to cope with these situations? These are good topics for discussion in a sound pre-release program prior to a man's being assigned to work release. An instance of this occurred just prior to my leaving the Federal Correction Institution at Terminal Island. On final discharge a girl work releasee came in one evening and said that she had a problem which had been building up over some time. It appears that in the office where she was working a young man had been paying particular attention to her and that she had used the usual stalling tactics because he didn't know anything about her. She told him that she was tired, or that she was busy this evening, or she had to go to the hairdresser, or she had to see her grandmother. On this particular day, he was not to be put off any longer, and he said exasperatingly, "Well, some people are pretty ritzy, they are pretty exclusive so Miss Exclusive just how do you really spend your evenings?" When she told me about this she smiled, and it really was a smile of a person in a real quandary. She said, "I wonder what he'd do if I told him how I spent my evenings?" I never learned how she resolved this situation, but this certainly was not one of the kind of problems that we envisioned when we implemented the work release program for adults on Terminal Island back in October of 1965. But this is the kind of problem that certainly can be discussed profitably for the client and for the administrator in a sound pre release program. We are not going to attempt to explore all the ways in which inmates can and might be prepared for pre release operation. I think it is sufficient to point out that if we have to rely on last minute preparations for return to the world, let's just forget it, just cool it, as they say. You are wasting your time spinning your wheels, if you start your treatment program in the last 90 days. Preparation has to begin as early as it possibly can in the sentence. If we've got an institution that is so repressive that we have a need for separate facilities, and I don't say this as criticism of anything that exists anywhere in the United States, but if we have to have a separate pre release facility, let's take a look at the institution we're operating, gentlemen. There's something wrong. If in the daily operations there isn't some provision for pre release, we have to move the man completely out of that institution; we have to break him away from his heavy regimentation, what in the name of God are we doing in 1967, operating such a heavily regimented institution. Perhaps you can satisfactorily answer this for yourselves, but I doubt it seriously that we could do this on a professional basis. Preparation must begin as early as possbile in the sentence and unless this is done, any last minute efforts are only wasteful of time and energy. Inmates must be told in advance of the purpose and the intent of the pre-release program.

An effective way of doing this is through distribution to potential participants of a descriptive handbook. There are many other ways. Strategically placed posters throughout the institution announcing the program and the contents of the program is another proven method of preparing inmates for pre release operation. Small group discussions and interpretations by various members of the staff is another method. There are many ways that you can advise the inmates of the purpose, intent, and content of the program. Above all things, whatever kind of preparation we might undertake, we have to insure that the pre release program that we put together provides for a period of evaluation in which the experiences of the client and the specialized knowledge of the staff may be examined in one final effort to point the way to realistic solutions of the many problems facing the person about to be released.

GROUP DISCUSSION:
PROBLEMS OF RESEARCH IN CORRECTIONS

GEORGE M. CAMP, Ph.D., MODERATOR

U. S. PENITENTIARY
MARION, ILLINOIS

PANEL: BERNARD C. KIRBY, Ph.D.

Department of Sociology
San Diego State College
San Diego, California

MERRITT K. GILMAN

Task force Director
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower
Washington, D. C.

CHARLES M. FRIEL, Ph.D.

Director of Research
Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences
Sam Houston State College
Huntsville, Texas

GORDON S. JAECK

Office of the Criminologist
Department of Public Safety
Joliet, Illinois

THE STEP PROGRAM AND WORK RELEASE

ROBERT E. JOYCE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

My remarks will center upon work release programs and the reaction of industry to this kind of undertaking. I want to confine my remarks because we have the greatest amount of information on the Danbury, Connecticut, Federal Correctional Institution Work Release program. I want to talk about the atttitudes and reactions of the businessmen in the Danbury area who have had experience in the work release of prisoners. I'd like to give some background on the role of the private sector in the social problem solving because I think it's pertinent to our discussion today.

Three years ago when the N.A.M. through which the STEP Program became involved in the Manpower Program there was little if any recognition of the private sector playing any crucial role in the solving of social problems. It has been stated that the majority of the public didn't feel that the private sector could or even that it should take a meaningful part in social problem solving. Many people questioned the very legitimacy of any private sector efforts in this area. We feel, and we have been pretty close to it in the past few years through the STEP program, that there has been a rather dramatic change in the attitude of both key leaders in the public sector and the general public at large. I'd like to point to a couple of examples of this. A recent piece of legislation was introduced into the Congress which was sponsored by Senators Pearson of Kansas and Kennedy of New York and it has this to say: "The bill is required, in fact, it is imperative if we are to correct in many cases what are abject failures of existing programs. We must rely on the private sector and the free enterprise system upon which it is based, if we are truly come to a revolution of such persistent problems." This referred to slum housing in urban cities, but the same concept applies to any field of social welfare. We feel it applies in work release programs. To give you an idea of the change of attitude of the general public, a Louis Harris poll was taken in July and asked two questions: "Do you think the present national efforts are leaning toward real solutions of domestic problems?" Seventy-three percent of the people who responded said no, sixteen percent

70

said yes, and eleven percent were undecided. The second question was: "Do you think that the private sector is capable of taking a significant role in resolving social problems if given the opportunity to launch all out efforts?" Eighty-one percent of the general public said yes, nine percent said no, and ten percent were undecided. This is indeed a very significant shift in the country's thinking. It is a general admission on all fronts that either our present efforts in many problems of social concern are failing, or at least there is room for great improvement, and that any meaningful effort toward improvement must include a significant effort to accellerate private sector involvement. I think it can safely be said that the successful accomplishments of the Danbury Work Release Program were due in no small measure to the willingness of the private sector to become involved in what appeared to be obvious risks and to accept the challenge of involvement in social problem solving. While most of the credit is due to the imagination and the initiative of the federal government officials who created the program, we can agree that no work release program can succeed without the understanding and the willingness and the wholehearted cooperation of the job creators in our society, the American industry.

Now I would like to talk about some of the details of the Danbury Program. The industrialists in that area, and there were 42 of them, became involved in the work release program from two points of view. One was the potential employers of the inmate and the second was the leading citizens of the community whose acceptance of the program was necessary for its success. Industry's point of view as an employer was best expressed in a quote by Edmund Baruch. He put it this way, "Prisoners were brought to our personnel offices, interviewed for jobs, carefully screened and tested, with their records clearly exposed and frankly discussed. We then went on to prepare our supervisory group for this program, explaining to them that the inmates would be working as regular employees of the corporation, would be paid regular wages, would report to work at regular times, and would be subject to all rules and regulations of regular employees." "Our first task," Mr. Baruch said, "was to allay fears and suspicions, on the part of the supervisors and the average shop employee. After a series of orientation lectures this was accomplished.

Now in a program of this type there had to be some stipulations and some ground rules established that would be agreed upon in order to counter the objections of management, of the unions, and of the workers themselves. These stipulations were that the employment of inmates would not result in the displacement of employed workers, employment would not be offered inmates in trades or skills in which there is a surplus of available labor in the area, inmates would be paid at the going rate for a given job, inmates would join the union if the plant was unionized, and agreements with the union stated that should a layoff be necessary, inmates would go first regardless of seniority.

The reaction of the regular employees to the inmates was a certain amount of apprehension and of course curiosity on the part of the workers in various plants. However, in a very short period of time, it was soon realized that the prisoners were intent on proving themselves both as an expression of their appreciation for being given an opportunity to work, and their deeply felt need to make up for lost time. It was important for the inmate that he be treated like everyone else. As a result they strove to be both considerate and tactful. A worker in one plant commented, "I never realized we had men from prison working here." A reply from another worker was, "Just what did you expect to see; they look like you and me."

Some of the economic benefits to the inmates and to the community were that the inmates sent half their earnings to their families and as a direct result many of these families went off relief. They paid $38,000 in state and federal taxes; and they spent $79,000 in the community in the first year of the program's operation. They paid their own transportation to and from work, and what I think is unusual, they paid their own room and board in the prison. Since the inception of the program as of about June this year, 274 inmates have been placed in jobs with industry, and almost 100 of them have completed their terms and have been released from prison, except for one man who has asked and was allowed to stay in prison a month longer because he was on the company softball team and they were in the city finals in the industrial league; he stayed. This to my knowledge is the first time anyone has asked to stay in prison beyond his term.

There are forty-two employers in the Danbury area who have cooperated in making the program a success by providing the necessary employment opportunities. The jobs which have been provided by industry have run the gamut from machine operators to sales correspondents. Of particular interest I think, is the involvement of industry in training inmates in prison prior to their engagement with the work release program, and the Dictagraph Products Company did this. They sent a foreman after working hours twice a week for several months to give courses in the electrical fundamentals and the repair of hearing aids. Following the completion of the course, a number of inmates were employed by Dictagraph as regular employees following their release from prison. Based on the outstanding work performance of these men, Dictagraph has initiated arrangements to set up a second program.

Recently, several manufacturers have indicated a strong interest in setting up training programs at the institution. A major automobile manufacturing concern which has an assembly plant in the Northern New Jersey area has experienced a great deal of difficulty in working with auto mechanic trainees who are insufficiently motivated and displayed rather poor attendance. They are very interested in working with the Federal Correctional Institutions; and the intend to bring all the necessary equipment and materials into the prison in order to train qualified inmates. This particular company, and it is a world-wide company by the way, is impressed with the opportunity to work with men who are highly motivated to acquire training and who have no problems in absenteeism. I'd like to quote some of the comments of Warden Kenton from the Federal Correctional Institution who stressed what the program did to help accomplish what prisons throughout the years have been unable to do, to give men the feeling of dignity, of being worthwhile, of being a productive human being, of being able to support his family. The Warden stated, "Nothing destroys like failure and the inmates have sustained failures all their lives. The key to what we have achieved is that through the work release program industry was able to provide the jobs that gave the inmates a sweet taste of success." Mr. Baruch indicated that all the inmates employed by the company have proven to be outstanding workers. He noted that their production records have exceeded those of the average employer in the shop and absenteeism is at a minimum. They have earned the respect of their fellow workers based on their deportment and productivity; they are a real asset to this corporation.

Should you discuss work release programs with industry in the area of the prison systems that you represent? You'll be interested in these comments. A stockholder of one corporation, at the stockholders meeting when the program was explained, said this, "I completely agree with what you are doing in the employment of prison inmates. More companies should follow this example."

Another stockholder said, "One of the most humane and worthy projects in our society. I'm sure the rewards will be great and will be reaped in the knowledge that you have been giving a man a second chance, a truly rare gift." These are the people who have the most to risk; it's their money that keeps the company going, they are the stockholders.

Here are some of the comments from the prisoners themselves that attest to the benefits of the program. One inmate said, "With this program things are different, I'm learning a trade and saving money from my wages. I'm not worried now about leaving prison and with the training and experience I'm getting at the plant, I'm not afraid of finding a good steady job." The inmates ability to adjust to an industrial environment, I think, can be greatly enhanced through proper educational and attitudinal training prior to assuming a job responsibility and can continue through the early stages of job experience.

One of the things that we at the N.A.M. have had some experience with and which is quite applicable here is in the basic education and skill training field. A system was developed at N.A.M. some three years ago because we felt that there was no system that specifically addressed itself to the rapid teaching of adult literacy. This program was called MIND which means methods of intellectual development. Through electronic media, tape recorders, program instruction workbooks and arrangements, this program can take an adult, who can be functionally illiterate, or absolutely illiterate, who can have a zero grade equivalency, and move him a grade a month or three to four grades in four months with an average of two hours a day, five days a week instruction. One hundred and sixty class hours of instruction can elevate a man four grades in the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. It doesn't require a professional teacher; it doesn't require a classroom setting. They function better with a monitor and the best kind of monitor is one who comes from the population group itself, in other words, it could most successfully be another inmate.

Rapid teaching through programmed instruction has gotten itself very successfully into the skilled trade field. The Reformatory in Petersburg, Virginia, is operating a program now using materials prepared by the Dupont Co. who has taken 155 different skilled trades and reduced them to programmed formats. These materials and methods are now commercially available. The Petersburg Reformatory instituted these and based on a study recently completed the average candidate completed a course in machine shop work in six months, welding in four and a half months, and both woodworking and auto mechanics in four months. The biggest key to success in programmed instruction is the fact that it builds success upon success. You start at whatever level you happen to be at the time you come into the program. Until you successfully complete the problem in front of you, you don't go on to the next frame. It is individualized instruction so that you can spend as much time as you need at any given spot and once you have mastered that, you then go on to the next phases, step by step, day by day, and month by month, and as a result of the motivation that is built on progress far exceeds that of traditional classroom setting. The student is highly motivated and his confidence increases. Because of the increase in self-confidence, this enables him to adjust to the outside industrial environment far more readily, plus the fact that his increased educational level, in such a short period of time, makes him more effective, hence, a more valuable employee to the industrialist. We've been involved with these programs and many programs of this type throughout the country. You have the information in front of you and at the end of my talk we are going to show a very short film that was produced by NBC's Today Show on the work release program at Danbury. I have to apologize for the quality of it because it is a conversion from video-tape, so it is going to be a little fuzzy but I think that you will find that it will amplify quite well upon the remarks that I have offered today. Should you have an interest in contacting any of these people whom I have talked about, we would be more than happy to work with you to put you in touch with them. Our role in this is that of the catalytic agent of American industry. We are happy to put the people with the problem in touch with the people with the solution.

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF A WORK RELEASE PROGRAM

ROBERT ANDERSON

CHIEF OF CLASSIFICATION AND AFTER-CARE
U. S. REFORMATORY
EL RENO, OKLAHOMA

As everyone is aware, work release is a concept which is neither unique to our country or new. I think possibly the only thing new is the acceptance by the community and in that regard the community has far out-stripped the people in corrections in terms of their capacity to accept new things. I believe that it gives us an idea of how inbred we become in our institutions in isolated areas and how far removed we can get from the community and community activities.

Work release is a part of almost every Federal institution, to a varying degree depending on the mission of the institution. There is a variety of programs and a variety of quality in these programs, but there is no variance in the value placed on work release by the participating staffs. It gives a flexibility to institutional work that has been long desired but tough to realize.

In a youth institution one of the main focuses of the work release program where we have a body of men with a low level of skill or no skill training, is to focus through a work release program on developing work habits, gaining satisfaction in meaningful work participation and feeling the success and enjoyment of being evaluated not by a correctional facility but by someone applying private employment standards. In your adult institutions the populations are not without skills, abilities, and work habits. So maybe you are trying to underwrite through work release program prior to release, a sustained achievement record in terms of support payments. By giving him a legitimate rate of pay and making restitution possible over a sustained period, a stability is developed in terms of responsibility meeting the expectations of the community.

There are probably differing opinions in regard to my next statement, but let's accept the idea that corrections overall has done the job pretty well in terms of our resources, our ingenuity, and our knowledge of human behavior. By using the new tool called work release doesn't mean that startling strides are going to be made overnight. It reminds me of the story of the woodcutter in the state of Washington, who was a brute of a man and cutting wood was play to him and he would cut six to eight cords a day with no strain. This chain saw salesman saw him and he could see this was a local reference point if he could sell the woodcutter a chain saw. So the salesman talked to him and said, "This saw could be a play thing in your hands. It would be tremendous. You could up your production to fourteen or sixteen cords a day with no trouble." The woodcutter said, "Well, I'm paid on a production basis and that sounds pretty good. I'd like to try it." So the sale was made and about a week later the woodcutter called the salesman and said, "Things are not going so well, I've upped my production to about ten cords and this saw cuts pretty well, but I'm getting pretty tired and it's just not as easy as you said it would be." So the salesman got right out there and checked over the saw and the tension on the chain was all right and the governor seemed to be free and working so he wound up the starter, he kicked it off, and the thing roared into the characteristic sound that a chain saw makes and the woodcutter says, "What's that noise?"

We are attempting to locate the noises and identify them with every new technique and new tool. However, determining just how this new tool can best be used is another matter. I suspect that we parallel it to a large extent within our own system, what Mr. Collins is referring to as evolution of the community treatment program and there are already indications that we are going to be evolving in our use of work release in a most constructive manner. Work release right now and even since this film was made, has changed in some degree in our own system. We have made an extensive study of what work release means but its impact on recidivism has not been determined. We have found that the escape rate in our system has been low enough to be tolerable. Public acceptance has been gratifying as this film indicated. Work release can supplement institutional programming and educational training. This is the general focus of work release in the federal system.

Now I will discuss how El Reno developed what we have at the reformatory. To put it in context, El Reno is a reformatory of about a thousand men ranging from 18-23 years of age and an average age of 21 years. It features traditional programs in education, vocational training, casework, medical services, recreation, and an industrial program, that incorporates a machine-tool and broom-making factories. The institution itself is situated on the outskirts of the town of El Reno. It has a population of 11 to 12 thousand and this is too small to afford an active or varied work release program. We are only about 30 to 45 minutes away from Oklahoma City and this is a metropolitan area of a half a million which contains a labor market of unskilled, skilled, or semi-skilled occupations. Because of the type of inmate we receive and his background, most of our activity has been in the semi-skilled and unskilled areas. Federal law allows the Attorney General to extend the limits of confinement and this is what makes our work release program possible. It also provides for furloughs for men going outside of our district, to apply for release jobs in the communities where they will be going. We were operating our work release program within four months following the passage of the aforementioned law. The first idea was that we would have a number of pilot project institutions, and that we would go through a demonstration project phase. This was soon expanded to all institutions which could qualify for participation in the program and who could indicate some benefit for their particular position.

Before implementing our program at El Reno and along with all other institutions in the federal system, we were responsible for explaining the purposes of this program and how we perceived it would be implemented in nearby communities. Contacts were made at both levels of government, state and municipal, and with law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and the judiciary. This was an attempt to solicit their acceptance if not their endorsement, so that we could get this program under way and see what the results would be. In most instances the response was very positive. Newspapers and television stations were contacted so that they could present our story to the public. They did this and were most helpful in presenting what we were trying to accomplish. Labor unions were also contacted and assurances were given that we would not place men in jobs that would adversely affect the local labor market. Speaking engagements were solicited before civic organizations; women's clubs, churches, and anybody who would give us a platform from which to present to the public what we hoped to do with the work release program.

When it comes to presenting a story to the public, I would caution everyone not to ignore a special agent and that is your own employee. Correctional employees have more influence than any other single effort you might marshall. They talk to neighbors, belong to clubs, and are a part of the community. They are probably talking to the same people you are hoping to get to. This man is a walking, breathing authority on corrections, and not only that but he has the inside dope working for you. So make certain that your initial effort is spent with that special public, the line employee. His official support in new programs will usually meet the official demands, but you need more than that. I believe that his unofficial support in the community contacts, that he has developed over the years can in effect make you or break you depending on his personal interpretation of a new program. How conservative a system you have and the attitudes that have developed in your system probably depends on how well you have sold the program to your line staff who must carry out the program. You might not win an individual employee over immediately, but I believe that if he is intelligently informed, knows not only what the official goals are, but the reasons and hopes behind them, then he can interpret the hopes for your new program, and as minimum, refrain from passing on negative judgements and dire predictions.

Another caution may be an oversimplification, but it is so important that I think sometimes we lose sight of it: When asking for public support of a new or different program do not assume that its merits are obvious. What persons or groups should be contacted? You should sit down ahead of time and make a check-list. We did in our agency, belatedly. It was amazing when we sat down and said, "All right, if we were to tell somebody, how to go about this, what agencies would we tell them to contact." This list far exceeded anything that any single person in the room would have touched on.

The selection of inmates to participate in work release involves combining guidelines that are general throughout the bureau of prisons system with an assessment of the individual inmate's potential for the program. The official guidelines issued to all institutions prescribe minimum custody classification as a prerequisite in all cases. Work release will not be authorized for offenders identified with organized crime activity, or persons convicted of serious crimes against other persons, in their record. Inmates whose offense involves violations of financial trust will not be considered for work release. Candidates for work release must be physically able to perform the assignment in which they are placed. This does not preclude placing a handicapped inmate in a job which is in keeping with his abilities. What we are going for is to match a man to the job, at least from a general standpoint. There must be evidence that the individual selected needs this kind of program — and a good case can be made that everybody needs this program, depending on your focus. Work release is not intended to be a program or status symbol available automatically to everyone who will qualify. It can be used as a pre-release tool providing an opportunity for individuals who need further transitional preparation for community life, or some specific training in the community that we can't offer in an institutional setting. Work release for some individuals may be an appropriate alternative to an institutional assignment where there is a family need or matter of restitution that would not otherwise be able to pay. It also provides for a release savings program that will help these men underwrite the cost of their return to the community.

We have a selection priority at El Reno with preference given to candidates whose residences will be in El Reno or Yukon, which is a metropolitan area between El Reno and Oklahoma City. Any judgement regarding the appropriateness of placing a man in this area if he is not a resident originally of that area, is not the prerogative of our staff. We would initiate such a program in what you might refer to as a transplant, but not without the approval of the Chief Probation Officer's in Oklahoma City. If he didn't approve the man wouldn't be placed because probation will be responsible for his eventual supervision.

Selection for work release begins with the initial classification screening process. At this stage we identify all those who can be considered for work release. We do however require that those selected must voluntarily submit an application before actual work release placement can occur. Some eligible inmates are hesitant to apply for one reason or another. We do not frown on caseworkers or custodial officers encouraging those inmates to submit an application. When we receive an application from an eligible inmate we then evaluate his total adjustment to the institution and solicit comments on his progress from the staff who are assigned to his program area.

It will be readily recognized that any work release program revolves around the rather crucial activity of placement. We are fortunate at El Reno to have a full time employment placement officer, who does nothing but develop a job placement and follow up. In job placement we make every attempt to match a man and his job, in terms of, his prior training, his aptitude, and his interest. Emphasis is placed on those types of employment training or job skills, rather than income being the paramount factor. As implied the job is often used to implement training which a man either received in the institution, or we might be underwriting training that he received while in the institution through the auspices of vocational rehabilitation. As an example we had a man sent down to us from Denver, Colorado, and his release plan followed through. He was an Oklahoma resident. They sent him to participate in our work release program well in advance of his parole date. He was accepted for training by vocational rehabilitation. He received welder's training and was placed in a local steel company as a welder's helper. This is the kind of flexibility, which this kind of programming can give you. I don't mean to ignore the fact that placements are sometimes made in areas which do not relate to prior training or which only indirectly relate because there are reality factors involved. The training which we have given the man prior to work release placement does not fit any available job. Work releasees have been employed in a variety of jobs such as welders, plumbers, even aircraft mechanics.

We in the federal system make every effort to train people in areas which will increase the opportunity for them to be hired. We try to avoid an overload in any particular trade or skill which could cause difficulty in the community in terms of displacing workers. Post-placement supervision is accomplished by two segments of our staff, the employment placement officer and our guidance center staff. They work as a team.

Our experience has been similar to that of probation and parole where the first six months of release seems to be the critical period. In work release the critical period seems to be the first six weeks where a man needs considerable support and guidance. During that first six months our contact with the employer is intensive and diminishes during the six months. During this period there has been a good relationship developed between our institution and the employer. Phone calls can be substituted as checks on how the man is doing, and whether he needs any assistance from us or we need assistance from him. Nothing should ever replace the initial face-to-face contact with the employer. In addition to expressing our interest and appreciation for his providing work for the releasee, this also provides the opportunity for us to continue to orient the employer regarding correctional factors such as security. I don't mean to imply that we would place an employer in a position of feeling responsible for how the man performs in the community. What we do ask is that if he absents himself from work for any period of time, that they notify us immediately. This is the one security which we ask the employer to handle.

It has been our experience that some employers have been over protective in their zeal to help a work releasee. While we appreciate their compassion, we hope to temper this so as to avoid situations where a man is given an opportunity to violate work release and the employer compromises by continuing that man in the program. When this does happen, I don't believe that we can do anything but accept the fact that we have failed to properly impress the employer with the necessity of rigid adherence to the work release agreement.

At the reformatory we have an outside structure which is apart from our main institution and outside of our security perimeter. It originally served as a bachelor officers' quarters. We now refer to it as the guidance center. I guess it can best be described as similar to a fraternity house. We have a 36 man capacity, made up of three man rooms. We have found that this facility eliminates many of the mechanical procedures which come with processing the number of men in and out on a daily basis. Senior staff members man this facility as counselors from seven-thirty in the morning to ten-thirty at night; and we do not man it with anybody from ten-thirty at night to seven-thirty in the morning. There are fire checks by our outside custodial personnel but essentially it is an unmanned facility. Outside quarters are not absolutely necessary to the work release program; but it is our experience that it diminishes what someone in our system has referred to as the Cinderella Syndrome, where the man is John Q. Citizen by day and prisoner by night. Not only does such a unit reduce the administrative need for devising a daily separation and admission procedure; but it reduces the possibility of pressure on the work releasee from the other segments of the population.

Often men admitted to our work release program want to continue academic and vocational training which they were enrolled in when they were placed on work release; and we have found that this is difficult to continue. When a man works 8 hours and he spends from two to four hours travelling, this is a 12 hour day. For all intent and purpose you pretty well lose your man in any vocational or academic training he might have been involved in at that time. All other activities continue and our caseworkers are scheduled one night a week, an hour to be spent at the work release unit to contact that portion of their caseload. An hour per case worker per week doesn't sound like much but when you break it down over our staff it means at the most probably five work releasees on one caseworker's load. Special activities such as formal courses in social living, release planning, and our traditional pre release program are scheduled for residents of our center. We allow them to visit with their families in the community and this takes the form of spending Saturday or Sunday in company of a parent or family member in the community, instead of visiting at the institution. They can participate in the scheduled recreational activites like local high school games, etc. We had some of our men contribute their labor for the county fair.

We have encountered some chronic problems and I know that anyone who has a work release program to some degree or another has experienced these. The first would be transportation and the second problem seems to be the combination of alcohol and women. I guess in the latter regard, our work releasees are pretty normal. Transportation difficulties, (and I don't know how you are going to resolve this) are created when a large number of men go in a number of directions and there are distances involved. Our work releasees are not allowed to drive their own cars; but we have a paradox because we allow some of them to drive the employer's car back to the institution if this is part of the employment arrangement. I think that transportation results in inordinate amounts of time spent travelling for our men, but not enough so as to cause us to cut back our program. Some job placements however, have to be deferred for a job placement of lesser quality just because of the transportation factor.

In most instances the failure of our work releasees does not come about because of criminality but failure generally can be traced to irresponsibility and impulsivity. Maybe these are reasons why most of the men are in an institution like El Reno Reformatory and this behavior is a continuation of the original problem. I thought of what Mr. O'Leary was talking about this morning in reform, rehabilitation, and reintegration. Sometimes you're trying to reform and other times you're trying to rehabilitate and other times you're trying to reintegrate. Sometimes I don't know what we're trying to do with a particular individual.

Despite the fact that we lack an in-depth study of work release, I think that we have sold the program to our staff and for the most part they endorse it because they have seen results. Since its inception at El Reno, 203 men have been in our program; 123 have completed it successfully and we currently have 22 men in the program. Removals include two men who requested to be taken off the program because of conflicts with their employer. Thirty-eight men were removed for violating institutional rules and regulations and 16 escaped. Our men have grossed $128,255.00 and they have paid their taxes. They have paid us for transportation, and reimbursed the Federal Government at the rate of $2.00 a day for room and board. They spent considerable amounts in the community; and I think they have an economic impact in the community. They sent money home to their families, but not so much as the work releasees at Danbury, where they have more married men with dependents. A considerable sum has been saved by these men for their release. I don't think that work release in and of itself will solve the recidivist problem. However, as an incentive and positive reinforcement of institutional accomplishment, as a complement to training, and as a method of reducing physical security for an eligible individual, I think that work release has more than justified its existence.

THE NEWS MEDIA AND WORK RELEASE

KUYK LOGAN

CITY EDITOR
THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA

As a newsman I'm seldom in the role of talking to people; my role is seeing that things are reported. I'm going to make a few comments and then leave some time to ask questions. I would like to say in the very beginning that work release in my personal opinion is a good program. I believe in it as a journalist and as an ordinary citizen. Taking everything into consideration, work release has been getting along very fine in Oklahoma in the last two years. It was two years ago this week, in fact, that they began a work release program at the Federal Reformatory at El Reno, which is about a thirty minute drive from Oklahoma City where I'm headquartered. It had a somewhat bumpy start. I think it is sailing along nicely. At least I don't hear any complaints from the general public anymore. That is the word that I would like to emphasize right now, the public. When asked to talk about work release and the press, I was really asked to discuss work release and the public, because in my opinion the words — public and press — are somewhat synonymous. I would like to take a moment to explain my line of reasoning. A newsman's job is to keep the public informed and when you gentlemen in the field of corrections talk or don't talk to the press, it is the public you have either talked to or haven't talked to. Now we are all very aware of the tremendous impact that newspapers, radio, and television news have on public opinion.

My knowledge of corrections is limited. Everything I say is based on what I have known in Oklahoma. In Oklahoma we have very few professional corrections people, and please note that I am trying to emphasize the word professional. We do have some people who allege to be in that line of work but a few of us newsmen are yet to be convinced. Most young people in Oklahoma and perhaps elsewhere are growing up without any background in corrections. So I'm going to ask the question today: How can we expect young newsmen to intellectually report; and how can we expect our young readers to intelligently interpret issues on corrections when they don't know what the word corrections means.

Now I am convinced that corrections can make a tremendous gain in receiving favorable press coverage and public support, by initiating a program to tell the corrections story to our nation's young people. I believe it is an exciting story and I believe it is a story that you people in the corrections field have kept to yourselves entirely too long, either by design or because you haven't been able to communicate with newsmen. Now I don't mean to imply that young journalists are completely ignorant of all phases of the corrections field. They do receive considerable information and opinion from law enforcement officers, judges, and prosecutors. Now these people — law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges, — can be very vocal. I surely don't need to tell you folks how varied their assessments of corrections can be. As an example I think the prosecutor in my city is very backward in the field of corrections. Had he been down here or had I told him I was coming down here, I honestly believe that he would say I was coming down to the do-gooder factory. When there is something going on in the field of corrections, he is one of the more vocal persons. Now like it or not, these are the men that we hear from in the news business when things are popping. The judges, law enforcement officers, as public officials are usually available for comment. As newsmen we report what they have to say to the public; and it's right here that public attitudes are molded as to whether the offender must be locked up forever or whether it might be possible or even favorable to make sincere efforts to rehabilitate him. It is not, in my opinion, the press's fault that modern corrections is having a tough time selling some of its new concepts. I would like to point out that I'm still talking about the situation in Oklahoma; I must speak from what I observe. I would like to say more specifically that the field of corrections has done a poor job of selling a good product. Now we realize that some of the problems of selling correctional programs have involved newsmen who think they know everything and close their minds to anything new. I'm going to be the first one to admit that we've got some rotten eggs in our profession but the majority of newsmen that you will encounter are people just like yourself. They take their profession seriously. They can be reasoned with and are genuinely interested in what's going on in the field of corrections. It is not always easy, and this is critically important, it's not always easy for us to comprehend in one press release what you gentlemen have taken years and years developing and perfecting. In other words you can't place a press release on our desks and initiate a program with the simple press release, and also expect us to really understand what you're trying to say. You go to school, you have seminars, you read things, and you communicate with each other, then in the same breath you turn around send a press release to the newspaper and when the newspaper doesn't print it, you believe that the newspaper is against corrections.

When work release came to Oklahoma two years ago, it was a totally new concept to most of us. For the most part we were very interested in following the program. Unfortunately, the first work release participant from the Federal Reformatory at El Reno walked off the job a few days after he first started it. He took 165 dollars with him and kept going. There is one fortunate thing for that new program, the man who had employed this prisoner had been screened pretty closely by the reformatory and I think he was a level headed citizen. I went back to my files to refresh my memory on that incident; and I wrote down a little quote that is very interesting. The employer said, "The money was nothing, but when I think what this might do to the work release program I'm just sick." The employer at the Coo Coo Hamburger Bar said that he would like to have another inmate. He was given another inmate and it worked out fine.

I believe that the Federal Reformatory at El Reno should be commended for its dealings with the press over this incident. They were quick to supply us with information about this man walking off the job. They were as quick to supply this information in an unhappy situation, as they were when they were trying to sell this program. This is very important in dealing with newsmen. Be as quick to tell "the bad" as you are "the good" and you will come out fine every time. To my knowledge everything in this incident was reported and their readiness to discuss the failures as well as the successes was most helpful to the reformatory. Warden Pontesso, established an open, congenial relationship with the news media from the very beginning. He was held in very high regard by most of the Oklahoma newsmen that knew him. Actually the reformatory has since the beginning of the program done a commendable job of dealing with the press, now I say since the program was started; they did a lousy job in starting it out. I believe that the

87

reformatory was rather negligent before the program got started. I don't believe that they did an adequate job of telling Oklahoma newsmen what work release was about before they started the program. I talked to Warden Pontesso over the phone just before I came down here to refresh my memory on some points and I found that in general he agreed with the way I remembered things. He said that he thought the news media of Oklahoma City gave him a fair shake. He said that he believed that they needed more time to implement the program as far as telling the community about it and telling newsmen, in other words he thought they had put it into effect too fast.

I believe that the reformatory should have invited a good number of Oklahoma City area newsmen out to the institution, let them see the building, let them see what's going on there, give them a tour, and a briefing on the work release program. I believe that this would have made our job of writing about the program a lot simpler if we had had some understanding of how work release was set up prior to its operation in the community. Just to give you an example, I have never been inside of the reformatory at El Reno; I have never been invited, and the reporters on my staff who are expected to write about work release were never invited over to El Reno. Now, please get me right on this, I'm not saying that we could not have gone over there and asked them. I'm sure that if I had called Warden Pontesso and said, "May I have a tour of your institution," he would have had a car waiting out front. But because they were tied up with the mechanics of getting this program going, I really believe that the press was sidelined. Maybe because they didn't have time. I don't want to be critical but I just want to tell the way things were. Yet we are expected to write about this. Everything was set up, such as an employer picked out here, and this car is going to pick him up, and this car will bring him back. They were so involved in that, that they didn't take time to figure out how they were going to get this going as far as the news media was concerned. In a way, we newsmen have a responsibility to go out and know about the institutions in our area, but we were just like you gentlemen, we have a thousand things to do and very little time to do it in sometimes, so this is why I think the burden of a new program is really on the institution. This is a common fault of my business. We, newsmen shouldn't be writing about some things till we know more about it; and you gentlemen know that in your field you sometimes have to do things without knowing anything about it. I think too few newsmen get around to visiting institutions in their area. So this means that you in the corrections field are going to have to be the aggressor and that you must get acquainted with the newsmen in your area. It is important that you know them, so that they can know you. You should know the police reporter whose job it is to track down or to write the story about the man who walks off from the work release program. I believe you should know the Federal Building reporter whose job will be to write the story about the work release escapee who will be brought back for the U. S. Commissioner. This is the reason you should get to know the newsmen not just the editors and the brass. If a police reporter gets a call that a man has walked off a job at the Coo Coo Hamburger Bar, and the police have picked him up down the highway ten miles, the police reporter will go down there to where this man has been picked up, he will get some quotes from the police officer, who in my area will generally say, "They shouldn't have let him out: that's what's wrong with work release." The police reporter will quote the police officers, or he may quote the prosecutor or the District Attorney the next morning who might also have mouthed off about the program. Nobody from the reformatory ever thinks of making themselves known to the police reporter so that he can get the other side of the story. Police reporters are young people: and they don't always know where to go to get information.

In going back on my newspaper files on work release in Oklahoma, I found that we had written a tremendous amount of stories on work release, and I honestly believe that we did a fair job of reporting on the work release in Oklahoma. There has been no doubt that in some instances the stories were not exactly as the El Reno staff would have liked them to have been written. If these stories were inaccurate or slanted, it was probably because our reporters were not able to get all the necessary information in time to meet our deadline, or because we were guilty of misunderstanding or misinterpreting. This is an occupational hazard. I feel the El Reno newspaper gave work release a fair shake also. Warden Pontasso disagrees with that; he feels that the Oklahoma City News Media was fair but there was some problem with the El Reno Newspaper. I called up the editor at the El Reno paper to ask how the situation was in his community when work release was started. Jack told me that the first time that his newspaper heard about work release was one day when a little story moved over the Associated Press wire that the Federal Reformatories were going to start work release. So the natural question popped up in his mind, well we have a reformatory here, are we going to have work release programs. So Jack's people called up the reformatory and found out that, yes in fact they were, that they were working on it. Well now gentlemen it is pretty sad when you have a big institution right in a community and it is getting ready to initiate a program that will depend on public support and news media support but you don't bring in the news media and the community from the beginning to start telling them about it. Yet on the other hand, people expect us to fully understand things and fully get involved in it. Once he called the reformatory, the reformatory was very cooperative, they told him everything about it. This is the problem we run into with the Federal Government. There are many people who are afraid to talk because they want to wait from the higher people to give them the word. We learn to tolerate some of this; but I think some of the troubles in reporting federal and state government programs are because people are afraid of us. We're really not too bad. The editorial stand of the El Reno paper was, "Let's give them a chance to work." The editor told me something that I thought was real interesting. Jack said that work release hit a snag in El Reno because he thought that the employees from the reformatory had been poorly briefed, and so when they went home at night they bad mouthed it in the community. The community opinion in part was based on what the employees from the reformatory said, "This was bad." When I talk about the employees I'm not talking about the administrative staff. I'm talking about the men down in the rank and file, maybe the mechanic or the janitor. The lower levels of the employee ranks were where the problem was. Now these snags have been pretty well ironed out in the community. Jack says that everybody is pretty happy with the program. He no longer hears any static. The law enforcement officers at El Reno were very much against it. I think that had they been given a little better briefing then when the program ran into difficulties here and there, and when the news media had talked to them, they wouldn't have said some of the things they did about work release. I think that generally they are just totally ignorant of the real value of work release.

Work release is working in Oklahoma and I believe that it is generally accepted by most of the people of the state. I only wish that our state prison and our state reformatory had some type of work release program. As you know or may not know Oklahoma is in the middle of a corrections revolution. We have a new corrections department that went into effect this summer in July and it is now headed by Mr. Pontesso, who has since retired from the federal service. We are proud of Mr. Pontesso. He's got some fine ideas and you can understand he's got many problems. He has demonstrated his ability to work with the press and to rally support. I have every good reason to believe that things are going to work out all right.

In the last three years the National Council on Crime and Delinquency's man in Oklahoma, Mr. John Cocoros, has done more to take away the cobwebs on corrections than anybody in Oklahoma's history. He has aggressively sought to meet with newsmen all over the state. John and I have talked for many hours about corrections and about news media relations. Now whether we see eye to eye on certain points is not the point but the thing that is important is that there has been an exchange of ideas.

Before I go back to Oklahoma City this afternoon, I would like to quickly review a few points that I've tried to get over this afternoon. They are:

1. Work release is working in Oklahoma.
2. The Federal Reformatory at El Reno is getting good press now because it has maintained open lines of communication. We do get the information from the reformatory when we need it.
3. Work release would have had an even smoother start in Oklahoma over the years had Oklahomans had more exposure to professional corrections.
4. Professional corrections people have a real good story to tell and they need to start telling their story at the grade school level. From the time a little boy or little girl starts in grade school, he is taught to obey policemen, and that policemen are good and are their friends. They hear about judges. They hear that if a man does something wrong he will be arrested by this policeman. They hear that he will be taken before this judge and in our democratic process there will be a jury to hear his case and if he is found guilty he will go to prison and that is where it stops. We tell our children all of this from the first grade. I can remember when I was taught for the first time about policemen and judges and juries. This is where it stopped and nobody ever told me about what happened to the poor guy after he went to prison. As far as we

knew he went to prison and we forgot about him. Yet we grow up in a society like this, with you good people trying to take these men who are in prison and rehabilitate them and return them to society; but we grow up in our school system without knowing any of this. It is no wonder that in some states, particularly my state, you people have such a hard job of selling corrections because the people have never heard of corrections.

5. Newsmen are products of their environment; and they can hardly be expected to report thoroughly or perhaps intelligently on anything they have never been exposed to.

I teach part-time at the University and I conducted a little survey before I came down here. It was a real quickie thrown together job. I wanted to check my thinking on something. This does not necessarily indicate how all the students think nor the extent of their knowledge. But the point I'm trying to make is somewhat proven by this little quickie survey, that people are getting into college who really don't know anything about corrections. These people who go into college in Oklahoma, and perhaps your state too, are the ones who elect to go into journalism. Now journalism schools are not supposed to teach somebody about corrections, history, medicine, government, or law. Journalism schools are to teach a young man or young woman how to write, and how to report. Now to give you an idea of what I'm talking about, we have many journalists who are coming out of our schools, and who have absolutely no background on corrections. As I pointed out the young newsmen are the ones who are putting out the newspapers today. They are the ones who go out and report on these programs that you may be involved in.

One question was: Do you know what a Halfway House is? Here are some of the comments from some of the students. A Halfway House is a house of prostitution, half prostitution and half dope, that's why it is called a Halfway House. A Halfway House is an alcoholic shelter. A Halfway House is a house on the golf course between the tenth and eleventh green — this is where you stop and get a coke. A Halfway House is a restaurant. If you are not from Oklahoma you wouldn't understand it, but we have a turnpike that runs from Tulsa to the Kansas border. It is the Will Rogers Turnpike and halfway up that turnpike is a beautiful restaurant that goes over the highway, and that's the Halfway

House. Those were the answers from some of them. Now obviously some of the students knew, and I got some pretty intelligent answers, but most of them left it blank, and those who didn't leave it blank threw in those answers.

Another question: Do you know what a work release program is? It is where students get out of school and work part-time that is a work release program. It is where prisoners work days and serve sentences at night. It is also a place where prisoners work and some of the sentences are reduced. Of the students who answered it, 75 percent did not know what a work release program was. I asked them, "What is a pardon?" I asked them, "What is the difference between parole and probation?" I won't take the time to give you the difference between parole and probation. I will say what a pardon is. A pardon is the release of a prisoner from death row. A pardon is where the balance of the sentence is ignored by a judge. A pardon is where the sentence is anulled. A pardon is where an execution has been delayed. A pardon is when the prisoner has been relieved by a judge. A pardon is when a prisoner is released because of new evidence.

Another question: Do you know what the causes of Juvenile Delinquency are? One of them is social stagnation. Another cause of juvenile delinquency is kids. Here is a bulletin — broken homes. Here is another one — parents. Here is my favorite — society's laxity. Some other answers were environment, lack of education, the family, and lack of ambition. One put down that the cause of juvenile delinquency is juveniles.

Now these are college sophomores, juniors, and seniors, who are going to go out and report correction news tomorrow. I don't want to indict my Alma Mater. I don't believe the journalism school is to blame. I believe that the corrections field is to blame for letting persons get this far in college, and through our school systems without any real instruction. From the time a child is about knee high, we teach them about germs and washing their hands. The medical profession has done a good job of getting points through to children when they are young; but I think that the corrections people have done a poor job of it. We get them to prison. We teach them all kinds of things about that in our citizenship classes but that is where it stops.

This was interesting and I think somewhat gratifying. I asked them if they believed in rehabilitation of prisoners and almost all of them said, "yes". I asked them how they felt about capital punishment and they broke even on it. Then I asked them why they gave whatever answer they gave to the question on capital punishment and I got some shocking answers but it all reflected ignorance. As I told my friend, John Cocoros, newsmen are really not opposed to corrections, as some of you corrections people possibly believe. It is just that we don't know any better and so I can't emphasize too much the importance of getting to know your local newsmen. Get to know the newsmen now, because a crisis is a poor time to get to know anybody. You are going to find that most any reporter at one time or another, even though he is as busy as you are, is available for a little talk and a cup of coffee. Who knows, you may get to like him!

I really appreciated the invitation to come down and talk to you.

GROUP DISCUSSION: THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PRE-RELEASE

J. E. BAKER, WARDEN, PRESIDING

PENITENTIARY OF NEW MEXICO
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

[Editor's Note]: Warden J. E. Baker asked Mr. Leo Jenkins to give a brief summary of the 1964 Pre Release Conference. Warden Baker then appointed a three man nominating committee to select from the membership a planning committee of five for the coming year. Dr. George Camp will serve as chairman of this committee. The host for the 1968 conference is Warden J. E. Baker, New Mexico Penitentiary, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

A TOUR OF THE TEXAS PRE RELEASE CENTER
RICHMOND, TEXAS

PRESIDING: WARDEN T. C. SANDERS

Speakers: Mr. Jesse Clark, Superintendent of Pre Release

Volunteers: Mr. Paul Boesch, Wrestling Promoter, Gulf Coast Area.

Mr. Charles Stranger, Houston Personnel Association.

Mr. W. C. Buchanan, Pre Release Committee, Houston Rotary Club.

Unit Professional Staff:

Mr. Lanny Lyle, Supervisor, Vocational Rehabilitation, Texas Education Agency.

Mr. Lyle Braden, Counselor, Texas Employment Agency.

Mr. Leo Griffin, Psychologist, Texas Department of Corrections.

Rev. Hylon Vickers, Protestant Chaplain, Texas Department of Corrections.

A tour of the facilities was conducted by Warden Sanders, and was followed by a luncheon. The session adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

NATIONAL PRE-RELEASE SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

Robert Anderson
Chief of Classification and After Care
El Reno, Oklahoma

Aileen Arakawa
Counselor
Texas Education Agency
Dallas, Texas

Allen M. Avery
Associate Director for Community Services
Washington, D. C.

David D. Bachman
Florida Division of Corrections
Tallahassee, Florida

J. E. Baker, Warden
New Mexico State Penitentiary
Santa Fe, New Mexico

C. L. Benson
Bureau of Prisons
Community Treatment Center
Houston, Texas

James Berger, Director
Division of Parole Supervision
Austin, Texas

Dr. George Beto, Director
Texas Department of Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

W. E. Booth
Avon Park Correctional Institution
Avon Park, Florida

Lou V. Brewer
Riverview Release Center
Newton, Iowa

Mrs. C. M. Broderick, Counselor
Vocational Rehabilitation
Texas Education Agency
Houston, Texas

W. C. Burton
National Association of Manufacturers
Houston, Texas

George M. Camp
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Marion, Illinois

William M. Campbell
South Carolina Department of Corrections
Columbia, South Carolina

Jesse E. Clark
Superintendent of Pre-Release
Texas Department of Corrections
Richmond, Texas

John A. Cocoros
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Austin, Texas

Gerald A. Collins
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D. C.

A. E. Cook
Assistant Superintendent
Glades Correctional Institute
Belle Glade, Florida

Clyde T. Cook
Texas Education Agency
Houston, Texas

Valjean Dickinson
Assistant Commissioner of
Correction
Indianapolis, Indiana

John Driskell
Texas Department of
Corrections
Richmond, Texas

William E. Flanigan
U. S. Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
Washington, D. C.

Raymon C. Forston
Department of Economics and
Sociology
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas

E. D. Franz
Board of Parole
Salem, Oregon

Merritt Gilman
Joint Comm. on Correctional
Manpower and Training
Washington, D. C.

Ed Harless
U. S. Penitentiary
Terre Haute, Indiana

Jack Heard
Assistant Director
Texas Department of
Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

Dean Hinders
South Dakota Penitentiary
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

J. J. Hodge
Bureau of Prisons
Community Treatment Center
Houston, Texas

James F. Howard, Superintendent
Commonwealth of Kentucky
La Grange Kentucky

Father Richard Houlahan, O.M.I.
Jester Pre-Release Unit
Texas Department of
Corrections
Richmond, Texas

Gail D. Hughes
Mo. Board of Probation and
Parole
Jefferson City, Missouri

Leon W. Hughes
Texas Department of
Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

Gordon S. Jaeck
Division of the Criminologist
Department of Public Safety
Joliet, Illinois

Leo Jenkins
Colorado Adult Division of
Parole
Canon City, Colorado

C. E. Jensen
Senior Caseworker
Federal Prison Camp
Elgin AFB, Florida

Lee C. Johnson
Pre-Release Center
McAlester, Oklahoma

Robert E. Joyce
National Association of
Manufacturers
New York, New York

O. J. Keller, Jr.
Director, Florida Division of
Child Training Schools
Tallahassee, Florida

George G. Killinger, Director
Institute of Contemporary
Corrections and the Behavioral
Sciences
Sam Houston State College
Huntsville, Texas

B. C. Kirby
Department of Sociology
San Diego State College
San Diego, California

A. D. Kelley, Jr.
Department of Corrections
Atlanta, Georgia

John Kehrberg
Volunteers of America
Minneapolis, Minnesota

W. Dee Kutach
Assistant Director - Treatment
Texas Department of
Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

Mark A. Levine
Department of Corrections
Baltimore, Maryland

S. N. Linsey
Bureau of Prisons
Community Treatment Center
Houston, Texas

Kuyk Logan
The Daily Oklahoman
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Oretha McNally
Counselor
Texas Education Agency
Dallas, Texas

James Mabry
Texas Department of
Corrections
Midway, Texas

J. D. Middlebrooks
Louisiana Correctional and
Industrial School
De Quincy, Louisiana

F. Moosberg
Board of Control
Des Moines, Iowa

Carolyn Parker
Vocational Rehabilitation
Dallas, Texas

B. H. Plymate
State Prison
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Albert W. Rice
Virginia State Penitentiary
Richmond, Virginia

Felix Rodriguez
Associate Warden, Custody
Penitentiary of New Mexico
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Edward A. Rufus, Director
Institution Parole Services
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

T. C. Sanders, Warden
Pre-Release Unit
Richmond, Texas

Leo Schmeige
Washington Correctional Center
Shelton, Washington

James D. Seymour
Florida State Prison
Raiford, Florida

Mark W. Sills
Texas Education Agency
Division of Vocational
Rehabilitation
Corpus Christi, Texas

A. E. Slayton, Jr.
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Richmond, Virginia

Carl Smucker
Illinois Youth Committee
Rockfort, Illinois

Lawrence A. Sneesby
Division of Corrections
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Howard Sublett, Warden
Texas Department of
Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

David H. Sutherlin
Work Release Administrator
U. S. Prisons
Terre Haute, Indiana

Father Robert P. Taylor, Director
St. Leonard's House
Chicago, Illinois

Fred Terrinoni
Department of Corrections
Baltimore, Maryland

J. L. Townsend
Employment Counselor
Avon Park Correctional
Institution
Avon Park, Florida

Michael Trower
Department of Economics and
Sociology
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas

Keith Turkington
Supervisor of Counselors
Vocational Guidance Service
Houston, Texas

L. E. Walters
Assistant Director
Training & Development
Department of Corrections
Atlanta, Georgia

1/Lt. Phillip D. Welsh
3320 Retraining Group
Lowry AFB, Colorado

Carl White
Missouri Department of
Corrections
Jefferson City, Missouri

William Winkler
Texas Department of
Corrections
Pre-Release Unit
Richmond, Texas

PROGRAM

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PRE RELEASE
LOWMAN STUDENT CENTER

SAM HOUSTON STATE COLLEGE
HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1967

9:00 A.M. REGISTRATION

9:30 A.M. WELCOME

Arleigh B. Templeton, Ed.D., President
Sam Houston State College

George J. Beto, Ph.D., Director
Texas Department of Corrections

Presiding: George G. Killinger, Ph.D., Director
Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences — Sam Houston State College

10:00 A.M.

Presiding: Leo Jenkins, Pre Release Center,
Canon City Colorado

Topic: "Halfway House Programs — A National Overview"

Speaker: O. J. Keller, Jr., Director, Division of Youth Services, State of Florida — Tallahassee

11:00 A.M. COFFEE BREAK

11:15 A.M.

Topic: "The Evolving Program of a Privately Operated Halfway House"

Speaker: Reverend Robert P. Taylor, Director
St. Leonard's House — Chicago, Illinois

12:15 Noon RECESS FOR LUNCH

12:30 P.M. LUNCHEON — LOWMAN STUDENT CENTER

1:30 P.M.

Topic: "The Employment Program of a Halfway House for Narcotic Addicts"

Speaker: Keith Turkington, Supervisor of Counselors
Jobs for Youth — Vocational Guidance Service
Houston

2:30 P.M. COFFEE BREAK

2:45 P.M. GROUP DISCUSSION

Subject: "Problems and Progress in our Programs"

Moderator: Leo Jenkins, Pre Release Center, Canon City, Colorado

Panel: David D. Bachman, Deputy Director for Inmate Treatment, Florida Division of Corrections — Tallahassee

First Lieutenant Phillip Welsh, Air Force Retraining Command — Lowry AFB, Colorado

Edward A. Rufus, Director
Institution Parole Services — Harrisburg Pennsylvania

4:00 P.M. ADJOURN

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1967

Presiding: George G. Killinger, Ph.D., Director,
Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences — Sam Houston State College

9:00 A.M.

Topic: "The Case For and Concept of Pre Release"

Speaker: Vincent O'Leary, Director of Research, Information and Training — National Council on Crime and Delinquency — New York, New York

11:00 A.M. COFFEE BREAK

11:15 A.M.

Topic: "The Changing Program of Pre Release at the Federal Level"

Speaker: Gerald A. Collins, Coordinator, Community Centers Program, Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D. C.

12:15 P.M. RECESS FOR LUNCH

12:30 P.M. LUNCHEON — LOWMAN STUDENT CENTER

1:15 P.M.

Topic: "A Warden Looks at Pre Release"

Speaker: J. E. Baker, Warden, Penitentiary of New Mexico,
Santa Fe, New Mexico

2:15 P.M. COFFEE BREAK

2:30 P.M.

Subject: "Problems of Research in Corrections"

Moderator: George M. Camp, Ph.D., U. S. Penitentiary
Marion, Illinois

Panel: Bernard C. Kirby, Ph.D., Department of Sociology
San Diego State College — San Diego, California

Merritt K. Gilman, Task Force Director
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower
Washington, D. C.

Charles M. Friel, Ph.D., Director of Research
Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the
Behavioral Sciences — Sam Houston State College

Gordon S. Jaeck, Office of the Criminologist
Department of Public Safety — Joliet, Illinois

4:00 P.M. ADJOURN

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1967

Presiding: W. Dee Kutach, Associate Director for Treatment
Texas Department of Corrections — Huntsville,
Texas

9:00 A.M.

Topic: "The STEP Program and Work Release"

Speaker: Robert E. Joyce, National Association of Manufacturers, New York, New York

10:00 A.M.	COFFEE BREAK
10:30 A.M.	
Topic:	"Management and Operation of a Work Release Program"
Speaker:	Robert Anderson, Chief of Classification and After-Care, U. S. Reformatory — El Reno, Oklahoma
12:00 Noon	RECESS FOR LUNCH
12:30 P.M.	LUNCHEON — LOWMAN STUDENT CENTER
1:30 P.M.	
Topic:	"The News Media and Work Release"
Speaker:	Kuyk Logan, City Editor, The Daily Oklahoman Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
2:30 P.M.	COFFEE BREAK
2:45 P.M.	GROUP DISCUSSION
Subject:	"The Future of the National Conference on Pre Release"
Presiding:	J. E. Baker, Warden, Penitentiary of New Mexico Santa Fe, New Mexico
4:00 P.M.	ADJOURN

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1967

9:00 A.M.	THE TEXAS PRE RELEASE PROGRAM
Host:	T. C. Sanders, Warden, Pre Release Center Texas Department of Corrections Richmond, Texas
Speaker:	J. E. Clark, Superintendent of Pre Release Pre Release Center Texas Department of Corrections Richmond, Texas
	TOUR OF FACILITIES